

The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1893.

THE GÖTTINGEN SCHOOL OF COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.¹

[The following review was found in a nearly completed form among the late Mr. Darbishire's papers. It has been printed under the supervision of Professor R. S. Conway, who is responsible for insertions in square brackets.]

THE school of philology which has Göttingen for its centre, and which is associated with the names of August Fick and Adalbert Bezzenberger, has a deservedly high reputation. It represents a middle standpoint between the conservatism of Curtius and the daring but somewhat arid speculation of Osthoff and Brugmann without falling into the pessimism of Johannes Schmidt. To judge merely by results the school which has given us Fick's Homeric discoveries and Collitz's paper on the palatals, to which may perhaps be added, without prejudging the objects of this paper, Bezzenberger's on the guttural-series, has laid the study under no slight obligation. Within the last two years two works of great weight have issued from this school, and as they are to a great extent interdependent it seems fitting to discuss them both together.

The fame of August Fick may indeed be expected to be greater among succeeding generations than in his own: great as his reputation is, I venture to think it is even yet entirely disproportionate to his merits, and that if he had adopted the usual advertising methods, he would long ago

have been enthroned as the king of philologists.

The fourth edition of his *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch* does not disappoint expectation. More could hardly be said: but if any feature is more worthy of note than the rest, it is the openness of mind which has permitted the discarding in this edition of whatever has become antiquated in the third, however valuable it may have been at the time. That this achievement is not unparalleled the history of philology in England will prove: that it is remarkable is shown by numerous examples to the contrary.

The fact that the work calls itself a dictionary however may lead this encomium to be misunderstood. I do not intend to imply that the latest 'theory' finds a place in it. On the contrary the most impressive fact about the volume is that it presupposes a carefully thought-out system which those who will may formulate from its pages, but is not set out in a lengthy disquisition. The gratitude which all readers of Fick's Homeric works must feel for the mode he has taken of supporting his view (which on the normal lines should have required volumes of 1000 pp. at least) will therefore be increased by this work in which the author's labour is exactly proportional to the reader's benefit.

As I give my adherence to Fick's view in almost every case in which Fick differs from other exponents I wish to state what in my opinion are those differences, and the considerations which support my

¹ Fick's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch d. idg. Sprachen*, ed. 4. Vol. 1. Göttingen 1891.
Bechtel, *Die Hauptprobleme d. idg. Lautlehre seit Schleicher*. Göttingen 1892.

judgment. On the mass of detail which makes up the body of the work it is not my intention to enter; one word of caution is perhaps necessary. Identifications of the most rash description are to be found on almost every page in apparent violation of all phonetic regularity. It must not be inferred that the author disbelieves in phonetic laws. He is not constructing a water-tight system into which no exceptions can leak: his work is to bring together from different languages words which are possibly related. True, the equation violates a law. If the law is right the equation is wrong—but if the equation is right the law is wrong.

The chief points on which Fick's views are distinctive are: 1. The classification of the I.E. peoples. 2. The I.E. system of sounds. The first of these is a well-known difficulty, and Fick's own championship of the Stammbaum theory against Schmidt's attack will be remembered; in fact to a certain extent the original object of the *Wörterbuch* was to show that successive common epochs could be distinguished by their vocabularies (*Sprachschätze*). Brugmann took an intermediate view—he made eight offshoots from the parent stock, but ascribed to them equal independence. Fick now makes twelve separate descendants which are the representatives of three older groups: instead therefore of an 'Asiatic' and a 'European' unity we now have (1) Asiatic, (2) *centum* and (3) *satem* branches of the main stock, subdividing into (1) Skt. Zend and Scythian; (2) Gk. Latin, Celtic, and Teutonic; and (3) Baltic, Slavic, Thracian, Phrygian, and Armenian respectively. Here I agree with Fick, in his postulate of intermediate unities, but I do not accept his third group. I believe Armenian to belong to the Asiatic branch; and, if Hirt's assignment of the Thracians and Phrygians to the *centum*-people be accepted, Fick's geographical continuity is destroyed.

On the other point the differences are more important.

Fick's classification is as follows:—

[On p. xxix. Fick gives this list of the sounds of the *Ursprache*—

Vowels:

e o ā; *ē ō ā*, the latter shortened to *e o a* in 'primary auslaut', else uniformly to *a*.

Mutes:

$\begin{cases} k & kh & g & gh & \text{palatalized to} \\ k' & kh' & g' & gh' & \text{before 'bright sounds'} \end{cases}$
ç *z* *zh*
t *th* *d* *dh*
p *ph* *b* *bh*

Liquids:

y and *v* : *i* and *u*
n and *m* : *ṇ* and *m̃*
r and *l* : *ṛ* and *ḷ*

Spirants:

j, *s* (✓ before soft (*weichen*) sounds) perhaps also capable of forming a syllable (*g*).

But on p. xxxvii. he remarks 'nachträglich' that he accepts Bezzenberger's three guttural series (*Bezz. Beitr.* xvi. 234), and that therefore this scheme needs modification by splitting the *k*-series into a *k*- and a *g*-series; he does not add whether he considers them to have been both equally liable to palatalization.]

Now, reserving for discussion below in connexion with Bechtel's book the controversial topics of the vowels, sonants and gutturals, it must be pointed out how admirably this system is framed. In the first place the recognition that *e*, *o*, *a* are the only vowels, and that *i*, *u* are the 'sonant' forms of *y*, *v*, is strictly logical, and the far-reaching importance of it will be shown immediately.¹ In the second place an equally meritorious feature is the distinction between 'independent' and 'dependent' sounds, which is also novel. It is true the only 'dependent' sound mentioned is *z* [Fick's *ç*], but the principle is recognized further by his ignoring *n*, *m* as independent sounds. In point of fact the distinction is historical, not natural, and its neglect is due to the exaggerated respect for the less-developed 'science' of phonetics which has done philology much harm. Phonetically speaking *m* *n* and *ṇ* are exactly similar, but philologically they differ, for Indo-European is only supposed to have possessed the sound *ṇ* because it is easier to say *ṇk* than *nk*. This may be admitted, but it is also easier to say *nt* than *mt* and yet we know that the form for 'hundred' was *kmtom* or *kmtom*. Incidentally it is interesting to notice that Bezzenberger's paper (*Bezz. Beitr.* xvi. 234) proves that the two classes of 'velar' gutturals were 'independent,' while Brugmann's view in the *Grundriss* i. makes them 'dependent.'

Those who know Professor Fick's previous controversial writings will not need to be told that nothing could be more delightful than the style of his introduction or more friendly than its tone towards his opponents

¹ The reader will see that this part of the review is not completed, a grievous loss in itself, but a small one compared to that of all the brilliant work which Mr. Darbishire's friends had learnt to expect from him.—R.S.C.

and his followers alike. The contrast in this respect on taking up Bechtel is striking and perhaps leads me to do him injustice.

His book is stimulating like Fick's but less convincing: its professed aim is to give a historical account of the gradual development which has taken place in philological views since Schleicher. He treats in turn the questions *a, e, o*; vowel changes; the gutturals; *l* and *r*. The preface tells us that chapters on the hard aspirates, on the distinction between *i* and *j*, *u* and *v*, and on the original accent were cut out: their loss must be regretted.

The fight that was fought over each of these questions is already in danger of being forgotten, and hence Bechtel's reminder that the dominant views are so young will be no less useful to the young than his history of the contest will be interesting to those who passed through it, and the work on the whole has been admirably done, although the style does not rise above the normal German level. Unfortunately, however, he has put in more than history: at first he sums up judiciously the result of the evidence, but by degrees this tends to become more and more an exposition of his own views on the subject in question, and these do not always commend themselves.

It cannot be forgotten that Bechtel was one of the most bitter critics of the new philology as represented by Brugmann's *Griech. Gram.* The acerbity of his tone he has greatly modified: it is still the deadly sin not to refer to any previous writer who has thrown out a suggestion in common with your view, but occasionally services are credited even to Brugmann, so that G. Meyer (whose own services by the way are quite neglected) is even deluded into speaking of Bechtel's 'Unparteilichkeit.' If this be not a mistake, German 'Unparteilichkeit' must be, like French calm, relative.

Perhaps the best of Bechtel's expositions are those in which he sums up the evidence against Brugmann's Skt. \tilde{a} = Gk. α theory and in favour of I. E. \bar{o} from $\bar{o}i$ + consonant.

Less successful is his treatment of $\bar{\theta}$ which he thinks becomes in Greek ι (or ν) as well as α . This, when taken in conjunction with his definition of $\bar{\psi}$ as $\bar{\theta} n$ (which, he does not deny, appears in Greek as α), gives an extraordinary fluidity to one's ideas. A few plausible examples are given for the rule in each case: it would really seem as if even B. requires to be told of the necessity for cogent proof, at all events he differs from the view I have always been taught to con-

sider right, that observation is not as important as right inference. This accounts for his indignation at any neglect of priority as well as for his own looseness of demonstration. I cannot help however adhering to the principle that to establish any rule it is first of all necessary to give some (not necessarily many) strong examples: next to show cause against all recognized derivations which are inconsistent with the rule, and in the third place to define exactly the limits of the rule itself. Some would add a physiological explanation of the phenomenon, but this is I think unnecessary. Once a phonological rule is established by the above method it becomes a fact for phoneticians which they may deal with as they like: the rule itself gains nothing from a physiological description, unless it is otherwise in need of support. It is only the establishment of a rule in this way that gives any claim to possession, and no one who has previously hazarded a guess at the result has any claim to priority because he happens to be right. For example, the first man who said 'German Vater = Lat. pater, German Bruder = Lat. frater' did not anticipate Verner's law, and if any one does ever prove that $\bar{\theta}$ becomes ι in Greek, B. has not anticipated him.

The treatment of consonantal questions is reduced by the expulsion of a chapter on the breathed aspirates and another on..... to a discussion of two *Hauptprobleme* only. One is of course the guttural question in which Bezzenberger is on the whole followed, and the other is the *l* and *r* question which contains little of note except an attack on Brugmann for not accepting Fortunatov's law (*B. B.* vi. 215 ff. and *Grundriss* i. p. 211 note). This is a good example of Bechtel's *Unparteilichkeit*: Brugmann says that Fortunatov's law rests to a great extent on uncertain etymologies: this charge Bechtel considers 'ungerecht' because out of Fortunatov's thirty-five etymologies twelve may be defended: to these he adds two of F.'s words but rejects his derivation, and produces again two that F. does not mention. Assuming that Bechtel's approval raises these etymologies above the domain of controversy, it seems still fair to describe Fortunatov's proof as *größten Teiles unsicher*. As for Brugmann's other charge that *es fehlt nicht an unerklärten Ausnahmen*, Bechtel admits some indeed, but dismisses them with an airy appeal to 'difference of dialect,' which is an explanation taken from the *Grundriss* i., but in its application is as unscientific as much of what has been criticized. Brugmann's position is: Vedic *l*

corresponds to a certain field of European *l*; Sanskrit *l* covers a wider field than Vedic *l*, but this wide field of *l* corresponds remarkably to European *l*, therefore it cannot have come through the narrower Vedic field and so represents a different dialect. This is good reasoning, true or untrue, but the exceptions to F.'s law, which B. discusses, are partly *Vedic words* and therefore by explaining them as due to dialect he is introducing dialectal differences into the Vedic hymns, which is a very different matter and highly improbable on the face of it. By way of showing up Brugmann's harsh treatment of F., Bechtel proceeds to imply that he accepts a rule of Weise's in the *Grundriss*, whereas Brugmann merely parenthetically observes that Weise has formulated it. I think a very little study of the *Grundriss* shows that more weight is given to a view which is discussed and refuted than to one which is simply credited to the authority on which it rests.

These remarks are not made with any view to contentiousness, for the only object of attack should be error, but they are

necessary for the very reason that the attack is veiled. There is quite enough to criticize in Brugmann's system without attacking him personally or making insinuations of unfairness: and I sum up my view of Bechtel's book by saying that the controversial parts are mostly barren, the original matter negligible, and the historico-critical parts excellent.

What then are the main points of the system which these two books represent? They are three in number. Vocalic formation, sonants, and the guttural system. It must be pointed out to begin with that these three are of very various importance: the last is merely a question of phonology, while the former two are fundamental and radical differences which can hardly be separated in discussion. As is well known, the accepted view places *l*, *g*, *m* and *ŋ* approximately on a level with *i* and *u* and, as I have said, I would go a step further . . . [The MS. ends here. *Fick's exclusion of i and u from the list of vowels was commended above.*]

H. D. DARBISHIRE.

ADVERSARIA (AESCH. AGAM.).

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 468—470.

τὸ δ' ὑπερκόπως κλύειν εἷ
βαρὺ· βάλλεται γὰρ ὄσσοις
Διόθεν κεραυνός.

Wecklein records sixteen attempts to emend the last four words. But all the correctors apparently think *κεραυνός* right, and *ὄσσοις* wrong. On general principles one would naturally suppose the rarer word and form *ὄσσοις* less likely to be the copyist's than the common word and form *κεραυνός*. Moreover it is universally admitted that *βάλλεται τις ὄσσοις* is more acceptable Greek than *βάλλεται κεραυνός*. But editors, unable to keep both *κεραυνός* and *ὄσσοις*, fall back on quotation from Herodotus (vii. 10) φιλέει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολοῦναι, and claim that we require here an equivalent to τὰ ὑπερέχοντα. Which saying is true; but Herodotus goes on with ὁ θεὸς φθονήσας in the same connection, and, if we are to deal in quotation, we must have our equivalent to *φθονήσας*, which is given in *ὄσσοις*. Moreover we can counter-quote *Ag.* 947 μή τις πρόσωθεν ὄμματος βάλοι φθόνος. But editors quote again Lucret. v.

1131 'invidia quoniam, ceu fulmine, summa vaporant,' from which however 'ceu fulmine' could be structurally eliminated. The fact is, we seem to desiderate three things, *φθόνος*, τὰ ὑπερέχοντα, *κεραυνός*, and we cannot have them (without the simile of Lucretius). Of the possible combinations of two out of the three things, one combination is impossible to our text, viz. *φθόνος* with *κεραυνός*. Keeping *ὄσσοις* we may read

βάλλεται γὰρ ὄσσοις
Διόθεν κάρανα.

where *κάρανα* = τὰ ὑπερέχοντα = *summa*.

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 545—549.

KH. ποθεῖν ποθοῦντα τήνδε γῆν στρατὸν
λέγεις;
XO. ὡς πόλλ' ἀμαυρᾶς ἐκ φρενός μ' ἀναστέ-
ναι.
KH. † πόθεν τὸ δύσφρον τοῦτ' ἐπὶν στίγος
στρατῶ; †
XO. πάλαι τὸ σιγᾶν φάρμακον βλάβης ἔχω.
KH. καὶ πῶς ἀπόντων κοράνων ἔτρεψεν τινάς;

Every one rejects *στρατῶ*. For conjectures

see Weeklein: I propose the minimum change

πόθεν τὸ δύσφρον; τοῦ τ' ἐπὶν στύγος κρά-
τους;

= 'and what loathed oppression lay on
you?'

στύγος κράτους like δεσπότου στύγει ('loathed
master') in *Cho.* 770. Cf. Τυδέως βία etc.
v. 546 implies that things have been wrong
at home. v. 549 ἔπρεψεν τινάς shows that,
though speaking darkly, the interlocutors
understood each other.

Agamemnon 649.

χεμῶν Ἀχαιῶν οὐκ ἀμήνιτον θεοῖς.

I think this is sound and means 'a storm
which ought to (or 'will') stir the wrath of
the gods of (= favourable to) the Achaeans.'
ἀμήνιτον θεοῖς is like νόσοις ἄθικτον of *Suppl.*
562 (Dind.), where I have pointed out the
distinction between such negative verbals
with the dative and with the genitive.
ἀμήνιτον θεοῖς = 'propter quam dei irasci non
debent,' and οὐκ ἄ. θεοῖς = 'propter quam dei
irasci debent.'

Agamemnon 778 sqq.

τὰ χρυσόπαστα δ' ἔδεθλα σὺν πίνῳ
χερῶν
παλιντρόποις ὄμμασι λιποῦσ' ὅσια προσέβα
τοῦ
δύναμιν οὐ σέβονσα πλούτων παράσημον αἶψα.

It is granted that *προσέβα* τοῦ is without
structure or metre. But Hermann's *προσέ-
μολε* is very far from a cure. Why not
προσέφατο? This implies *προσέμολε* and
gives a more poetical turn. 'She addresses
herself to the righteous.'

Agamemnon 1348—1371.

The tone and action of the chorus here
appear to me to have been wholly mis-
understood. Mr. Sidgwick is very hard
upon the 'grave and reverend' seniors. He
finds them 'a helpless and hesitating mob,'
charges them with 'sententious incom-
petence' and 'shuffling off of responsibility.'
Dr. Verrall is harder still, going so far as
to say at one place 'this speaker is utterly
helpless, the next almost idiotic with terror.'
To me it is inconceivable

(1) that the chorus which has previously
been so consistently sage and dignified
should become 'almost idiotic' or 'sententi-
ously incompetent';

(2) that a chorus which becomes either
of these things should subsequently (vv.
1399 to the end) prove so steadily cour-
ageous;

(3) that Aeschylus should in any case
place his chorus, particularly one of reverend
old men, in the humiliating position of talk-
ing worse nonsense than Launcelot Gobbo
answered by Dogberry on the one side and
Polonius on the other.

That a chorus should express fear or
lamentation is common and natural enough,
but I cannot discover any chorus which is
rendered absolutely contemptible. *Actoris
partes chorus officiumque virile defendat* says
Horace, but there is nothing *virile* about
the present chorus, as its action is usually
conceived. It utterly lacks the *ἐπιείκεια*
demanded by Aristotle and ruins the *ἥθος*
of the tragedy. A contemptible chorus is
comic and not tragic.

No doubt there is often a certain clumsi-
ness, a hitch in the action, observable in
the construction of a Greek play, when we
treat it as literature. Stage exigencies
often demand that time, which can ap-
parently be ill spared, should be passed in
discussion which we should on matter-of-
fact grounds regard as somewhat tedious
or frivolous. But, with only the text and
not the action or the stage-directions before
us, we are apt to misjudge even these
instances, and to suppose the Greek play-
wrights guilty of more awkwardness than
they actually committed. If we could see
the chorus at this juncture acting and moving
as the stage-manager of Aeschylus made
them act and move, and if we could hear their
tones and emphasis as they uttered these
lines, we should form a very different notion
of their attitude.

Inasmuch, however, as we cannot enjoy
this advantage, we must do our best to
realize their tone by (1) translating correctly,
(2) emphasizing the proper words. We may
also, perhaps, now that we have begun to
re-enact Greek plays and to apply to
dramatic literature something more than
verbal criticism, endeavour to supply our
own stage-directions. I should suggest, as
the crudest stage-directions, that (α) each
member of the chorus should speak with
rapidity and eagerness and with vehement
gesture, (β) that each speaker should move
or make as if to move towards the palace,
and that they should only be stopped from
approaching it at v. 1371 by 'enter Clytem-
nestra.'

For the translation, I should draw atten-
tion to the following emphatic words in

particular, viz. δρᾶν (1353), βουλῆς and ὀρώντος (1358—9), λόγοισι (1361). That these words are emphatic is shown either by strong position or by antithesis. By putting the proper stress upon these words I believe it will be found that, after the first speaker, *all the members of the chorus alike are bent on immediate action*, that they display no hesitating incompetence whatever; and that it is merely stage exigencies which prevent them from rushing on to the stage with one accord, one speaker taking up another with the *same view variously expressed*.

A rough literal translation (in which I must be permitted to express emphasis by italics) would read as follows:—

A. 'For my part I give you my judgment, that we summon a rescue of the citizens to the palace.'

B. 'Nay, best, I think, to rush in *at once*, and prove the deed by witness of the sword still freshly dripping.'

C. 'And I too, sharing in that view, vote for *doing*. It is no moment for delay.'

D. 'It is plain to see. They are sounding the prelude which betokens subjection of the realm.'

E. 'Yes, for we are *tarrying*: while they, treading underfoot awe of the Future, are wakeful and a-doing.'

F. 'I know not what *counsel* I can utter to good purpose. It is the man who *acts* that can also form a counsel.'

G. 'That is my view too; for I see no way *by words* to raise again a man when he is dead.'

H. 'Are we, just to prolong our lives, to yield to the rule of these shamers of the house?'

I. 'Nay, it is not tolerable. Better to die. For that is a milder lot than tyranny.'

J. 'Nay, shall we by signs from groans augur of the man that he is dead?'

K. 'We must know the facts with certainty, and then talk of them (*μνθεῖσθαι*). Guessing and certainty are things apart.'

L. 'My judgment is wholly in favour of that view—to know with certainty the plight of Atreus' son.'

Thus all the chorus makes for the palace. The inducements are variously expressed:—

A. opens the question.

B. says 'let us convict them in the act.'

C. agrees: 'yes, let us be doing.'

D. says 'let us nip their usurpation in the bud.'

E. agrees: 'yes, they must not work while we stand still.'

F. says 'if we act first, we can deliberate afterwards.'

G. assents: 'yes, talking will not bring him to life again.'

H. says 'let us beard them at the risk of death.'

I. assents: 'yes, better death than servitude.'

J. says 'moreover, he may not yet be dead.'

K. assents: 'yes, let us settle that point at least.'

L. sums up.

It is the couplet marked F which has chiefly led commentators astray. βουλῆς and ὀρώντος represent of course the λόγος and ἔργον, and the meaning is 'if we talk, we may be too late to act, whereas if we act we shall put ourselves in a position to debate to some purpose'; literally 'to him who *acts* belongs also the coming to a conclusion on a matter.' Editors can also have adopted *θυμοῖσθαι* in v. 1368 only in ignorance of the whole position, and that unfortunate conjecture has probably been the means of diverting many a student from discovering the truth.

In the couplet E, I have translated 'awe of the Future' from a correction of my own, which does not, of course, affect the general sense even of that couplet separately. The editions have (vv. 1356—7)

χρονίζομεν γάρ· οἱ δὲ τῆς μελλοῦς κλέος
πέδοι πατοῦντες οὐ καθεύδουσιν χερσὶ.

The MSS. give πέδον and τῆς μελλούσης κλέος or οἱ δὲ μελλούσης κλέος. Trypho records ὦδε τῆς μελλοῦς χάριν. Obviously τῆς μελλοῦς is right; and obviously also μελλούσης may have come directly from ignorance of the form μελλοῦς and conscious alteration to the participle. But the -ης of μελλούσης may have had a less obvious origin. As in *Cho.*

^{ησ}
160 we find a MS. reading σκυθῖτα for Σκυθικά, where κ, written as correction of τ, became ισ and thence ης (so Mr. Housman, *Journal of Philology* vol. xvi. no. 32), so here -ης may be another trace of interlinear Κ becoming ΙC and thence -ης. That κ is the κ of κλέος, which is itself spurious. The true reading I believe to be

οἱ δὲ τῆς Μ ε λ λ ο ῦ ς δέ ο ς
πέδοι πατοῦντες

'treading down the awe of Mello.' Μελλώ, like Παιώ, is a goddess, the personification, not of delay, but of that which is to be. The process of corruption starts from ΜΕΛΛΟΥCΔΕΟC by Δ becoming Λ. The κ to make κλέος may have been written over

Κ

thus ΜΕΛΛΟΥCΛΕΟC. At the same time it is perhaps not necessary to assume more than a corruption (1) of δέος to κλέος and (2) a 'correction' of μελλοῦς to μελλούσης.
T. G. TUCKER.

N.B.—In p. 250 a (*Iph. Aut.* 573) ῥσθα is wrongly written for ῥδσθα.

NOTES ON SOPHOCLES.

Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 723—725.

τοιαῦτα φῆμαι μαντικαὶ διώρισαν,
ὣν ἐντρέπον σὺ μηδέν· ὦν γὰρ ἂν θεὸς
χρεῖαν ἐρευνᾷ ραδίως αὐτὸς φανεί.

The editors, who accept the text as above, follow in the line of the Scholiast's explanation of the words ὦν ἂν θεὸς χρεῖαν ἐρευνᾷ. His comment is ἂν ὁ θεὸς ζητῇ πρέποντα κρίνας ζητεῖσθαι. Now, even assuming that ὦν χρεῖαν is the equivalent of ἂν χρήσιμα ὄντα, there would be something to be said as to the appositeness of the expression in this context. But the only legitimate meaning of the sentence is: 'God will readily disclose those matters, whose advantage he investigates': cf. Plat. *Rep.* 371 E where hired labourers are defined as πωλοῦντες τὴν τῆς ἰσχύος χρεῖαν. L. and S. adopt this meaning of χρεῖα and elicit some kind of sense by treating ὦν as adverbial, which is impossible. Again, if χρεῖα means 'need,' it is surely nonsense to introduce the god as *searching* for a need of something. On the other hand Elmsley confessed himself unable to understand the meaning, Musgrave proposed ἦν for ὦν ('quod negotium') which is not specially attractive, and Blaydes has several improbable conjectures. I believe that χρεῖαν means 'need' or 'necessity' and would replace ἐρευνᾷ by ἀνείρη. Mr. Housman has more than once called attention to the curious trick of the scribes in changing the order of letters in a word, and if Sophocles wrote εῖ for η the two words contain exactly the same letters.

Oed. Tyr. 1526.

οὐστὶς οὐ ζήλω πολιτῶν καὶ τύχαις ἐπιβλέπων.

There are two serious difficulties in these concluding lines of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. The lesser concerns the construction of ἀλβίζειν in v. 1529, but the greater arises from the MSS. reading of v. 1526, which is

undoubtedly corrupt. All editors seem to have made Οἰδίπους in v. 1524 the subject to ἐλήλυθεν and εἰς ὅσον dependent on λείσσετε. Blaydes rightly observes that we should expect Οἰδίπουν τόνδε, and I should prefer to supply ἐστίν in 1524 'See, here is Oedipus,' and connect εἰς ὅσον with the verb contained in ἐπιβλέπων. If this point is once grasped, it becomes easy to write (partly after Musgrave) ὦν τίς οὐ ζήλω πολιτῶν καὶ τύχαις ἐπιβλέπει; ὅστις naturally passed to ὅστις, even apart from the ὅς of the preceding line, and βλέπων for βλέπει is a mere blunder, perhaps due to the influence of the last syllable of πολιτῶν. ζήλω καὶ τύχαις is a kind of hendiadys, and for the meaning of ζήλος cf. *Al.* 503. This view of the passage has the further advantage of clearing up the construction of ἀλβίζειν, for we may put a comma at ἐλήλυθεν, and find a subject for the infinitive in the words τίς οὐ πολιτῶν now that the influence of these words is extended throughout the following line. It may still be a question whether θνητὸν ὄνθ' agrees with μηδένα or with the subject of ἀλβίζειν, but it seems very harsh to separate ὄνθ' from ἐπισκοποῦντα which is involved in the former alternative. Prof. Jebb now treats ἀλβίζειν as an imperative of the third person, but surely a subject is needed. If it be objected to the view given above that θνητὸν ὄνθ'.....ἐπισκοποῦντα ought to be in the nom., we may reply (1) that the usage of the language is not constant, Thuc. i. 12, 1 (*Stahl*), vii. 34, 6; and (2) that the symmetry of the passage is interfered with by the intervening subordinate clause.

Soph. *Trach.* 903.

κρίψας' ἐαντὶν ἔνθα μὴ τις εἰσῶδι.

On p. 7 of the *Classical Review* for this year Prof. Sonnenschein writes (doubtless unintentionally) as though ἔνθα μὴ τις εἰσῶδι

were the normal correlative in historic sequence of the primary *ἐνθα μή τις ὄψεται*. Of course this is not the case, since as a rule the future indicative is retained in this construction even after historic tenses. The usual explanation given of this puzzling optative is that it is due to the final clause (Goodwin § 573), while Prof. Jebb modifies this view by treating the construction as a development of the indirect deliberative. But both interpretations require corroborative support, and it is remarkable that all the suggested parallels are optatives which are often ambiguous, for it is hardly likely that any one would on the strength of this passage revive the exploded reading in Thuc. vii. 25 *πρέσβεις ἄγονσα οἵπερ τὰ σαφέστατα φράσωσιν*. The only passage which is in any way parallel is Soph. *Phil.* 277 *ἄνδρα οὐδέν' ἐντοπον (ἑώρων) οὐχ ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν*, and this is best explained as an indirect deliberative, though it differs from the normal type (1) by the expression of the object to the main verb; and (2) as representing an original *τίς ἀρκέσῃ*; a rare but not unexampled construction (Goodwin § 289). Indeed, this passage has been thoroughly examined by Mr. Sidgwick in the March number of this *Review*, and in support of my contention I would quote his remark that Sophocles 'would not have allowed himself to say *παρῇν*

τις ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν or any other simple relative use aloof from the deliberative.' In *Trach.* 903 however it is hard to find any vestige of the indirect deliberative, and it is worth while to consider if some other explanation is not possible. In a precisely similar context in *Oed. Tyr.* 796 *ἐφενγον ἐνθα μήποτ' ὀψοίμην* we find the future optative, and I believe that the explanation of the use of the mood is the same in both passages. The future optative points to a case of virtual oratio obliqua and we should interpret: 'I fled to some spot where *as I thought* I should never see...' Indeed the whole context accentuates this significance of the optative. Similarly here: 'hiding herself in some spot where she thought none had seen her.' The negative *μή*, which is generic and adheres closely to *ἐνθα*, is no obstacle to this view. It is true that this construction, whereby the thought of the person named is represented by the mood of the verb in an ordinary relative clause, is comparatively rare in Greek, but it is known to Sophocles: cf. *Oed. Tyr.* 1246 *μνήμην παλαιῶν σπερμάτων ἔχουσ', ἐφ' ὧν θάνοι μὲν αὐτός κ.τ.λ.* So Pind. *Ol.* vi. 49 *ἅπαντας ἐν οἴκῳ εἶρετο παῖδα, τὸν Εὐάδνα τέκoi*. More familiar is the use after *ὅτι* and *ὥς*, as in Thuc. ii. 21, iv. 65.

A. C. PEARSON.

EURIPIDEAN NOTES.

Heracl. 3.

ὁ δ' εἰς τὸ κέρδος λῆμ' ἔχων ἀνεμμένον.

Read *ἀνημμένον* 'made fast,' a familiar nautical metaphor: cf. *Med.* 770 *ἐκ τοῦδ' ἀναψόμεσθα πρυμνήτην κάλων*. The construction of *εἰς* c. acc. occurs *Phoen.* 569 *ἀμαβείς Ἀδραστος χάριτας εἰς σ' ἀνήψατο*.

Heracl. 280 sq.

λαμπρὸς δ' ἀκούσας σὴν ὕβριν φανήσεται
σοὶ καὶ πολίταις γῆν τε τῆδε καὶ φυτοῖς.

Read *λυπρὸς* for *λαμπρὸς* and cf. *Med.* 301 *κρείσσω νομισθεῖς λυπρὸς ἐν πόλει φανεί*. By the opposite confusion *λυπρῶς* appears for *λαμπρῶς* in *Bacch.* 814, where Mr. Palmer has anticipated me in the conjecture.

H. F. 195.

ὅσοι δὲ τόξοις χεῖρ' ἔχουσιν εὐστοχον.

Read *ὅσοι δὲ χερσὶ τόξ' ἔχουσιν εὐστοχα*. Cf. *Hel.* 76, *εὐστόχοι πτέρωι*.

H. F. 667 sq.

ἴσον αὖτ' ἐν νεφέλαισιν ἄ-
στρον ναύταις ἀριθμὸς πέλει.

Read rather *πρέπει* than *πέλει*. Cf. Soph. *Antig.* 478, where for *ἐκπέλει* Blaydes reads *οὐν πρέπει*: I would read *εὐπρεπές*.

Hipp. 294.

γυναικες αἶδε συγκαθιστάναί νόσον.

Notwithstanding Wecklein's expressed

and Wilamowitz' tacit support of the text, I cannot make myself believe that γυναῖκες is right. It seems to me to have supplanted, as gloss, another word, viz. πάριςιν.

I. T. 567.

ὁ τοῦ θανόντος δ' ἔστι παῖς Ἄργει πατρός;

The arrangement of the three last words of this verse is to me intolerably harsh, even obscure, and I cannot believe them to have been so placed by Euripides. Rather ἔστ' ἔτ' Ἄργει παῖς πατρός;

I. T. 725 sq.

ἀπέλθεθ' ὑμεῖς καὶ παρεντρεπίζετε
τῶνδον μολόντες τοῖς ἐφεστῶσι σφαγῇ.

μολόντες in v. 726 is doubly objectionable: (1) it is otiose after ἀπέλθεθ' in v. 725; (2) it could properly stand where it does, only if instead of τῶνδον we had e.g. ἔσω (unless we are to understand ἔσω from ἔνδον); but then παρεντρεπίζετε would lack an object, which it seems to require. I would therefore write μέλοντα, comparing v. 624 (ἔσω δόμων τῶνδ' εἰσὶν οἷς μέλει τάδε) and v. 470 sq. (ναοῦ δ' ἔσω στείχοντες ἐντρεπίζετε | ἃ χρὴ πρὸς τοῖς παροῦσι καὶ νομίζεται). The sense is then: 'Aid those who have charge of the sacrificial act in making ready the matters within (the temple) which are in their charge.'

Hec. 19 sq.

καλῶς παρ' ἀνδρὶ Θρηκὶ πατρώϊω ξένωι
τροφαῖσιν ὥς τις πτόρθος ἡξέμεν τάλας.

τάλας I believe to be wrong. Everything is pictured in the most favourable colours from v. 16 to v. 20. Polydorus' 'wretchedness' begins after the events narrated in vv. 21—24, and then he does call himself 'wretched' (τὸν ταλαίπωρον v. 25). I would read in v. 20 μέγας, comparing Bacch. 183 (αὔξεισθαι μέγαν). Thus too is the comparison with πτόρθος properly carried out. (The *locus classicus* for such comparisons is Hom. *Od.* vi. 162 sq.)

Hec. 153.

φοινισσομένην αἵματι παρθένον.

A most inharmonious verse. We should, I think, reverse the order of words and read παρθένον αἵματι φοινισσομένην.

Hec. 585 sq.

ὦ θύγατερ, οὐκ οἶδ' εἰς ὃ τι βλέψω κακῶν
πολλῶν παρόντων· ἦν γὰρ ἄψωμαί τινος,
τόδ' οὐκ ἔαι με, παρακαλεῖ δ' ἐκείθεν αὖ
λύπη τις ἄλλη διάδοχος κακῶν κακοῖς.

Something is certainly wrong with τόδ' οὐκ ἔαι με. 'If I have laid hold of any (evil), this does not allow me, but I am called off by another grief in another quarter.' What 'does not allow'? The evil seized? Nonsense. 'Does not allow me'—to do what? To keep hold of it (ἔχεσθαι)? Nonsense again. To be brief, I emend thus:

ἦν γὰρ ἄπτωμαι τινος,
τόδ' οὐκ ἐῶμαι, παρακαλεῖ δ' κτέ.

'If I seek to grasp any (evil, grief), this I am not allowed (to do, i.e. ἄψασθαι implied in what precedes), but am called off' &c. ἄπτωμαι became ἄψωμαι under the influence of βλέπω above it. τόδε is, of course, acc. of inner object w. ἐῶμαι.

Hec. 833 sq.

τὸν θανόντα τόνδ' ὄραϊς;
τοῦτον καλῶς ὀρών ὄντα κηδεστήν σέθεν
δράσεις.

ὄντα, for τὸν ὄντα. The omission of the article is deserving of notice. Compare Aesch. Cho. 353, Pers. 247. (Paley.) What is 'deserving of notice' is the utter weakness and insipidity of ὄντα, and also the fact that it stands under ὄντα in the preceding verse. It is, of course, an error. Read ἄνδρα.

Hec. 882.

σὺν ταῖσδε τὸν ἐμὸν φονέα τιμωρήσομαι.

τὸν ἐμὸν φονέα is a somewhat strange expression (though of course poetically possible) for the murderer of one's child: besides the successive tribrachs make a bad verse. I would suggest τέκνον φονέα. The affectionate tone of τέκνον is eminently appropriate here.

Hec. 1293—5.

ἵτε πρὸς λιμένας σκηνάς τε, φίλοι,
τῶν δεσποσύνων πειρασόμεναι
μόχθων· στερρὰ γὰρ ἀνάγκη.

That δεσποσύνων has maintained itself, as it seems to have done, criticis intactum, is perhaps due to its position at that point where the reader is ready to lay down the play. I have no hesitation in writing in its stead δουλοσύνην: cf. v. 448 sq. (also of the chorus) τῷ δουλόσυνος πρὸς οἶκον | κτηθείς ἀφίξομαι.

H. F. 445 sqq.

ἀλοχόν τε φίλην ὑπὸ σειραίοις
ποσὶν ἔκουνσαν τέκνα καὶ γεραίον
πατέρ' Ἡρακλέους.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff maintains the integrity of the traditional text here, and in this I am not disposed to differ with him; but his notes on vv. 145 and 147 seem to contain such strange things as to demand more than a passing notice. They run thus: 'ὑπὸ ποσὶν sind die kinder, wie man in stehender formel sage, dass die rosse ὑφ' ἄρμασιν sind, "unten an." Die wendung kam Eur. wol, weil er ein ähnliches bild wählte, obwol die kinder nicht ziehen, sondern gezogen werden. [One might think this a decidedly disturbing element in the picture!] Megaras füsse sind für die kinder σείραιοι, weil sie mit den eignen nicht vorwärts kommen. [A glance at the scene of the children's murder, vv. 971 sqq., will prove that they were somewhat more active on their feet than that.] Denn wenn die jochpferde nicht genügen, so spannt man ein leinpferd, σείραιος, daneben, so tut es Patroklos, Π 152. Orest. 1016 kommt Pylades und stützt den kranken Orestes, ἰθύνων νοσέρων

κῶλον Ὀρίστον ποδὶ κηδοσύνῳ παράσειρος....' 'πατέρα hängt natürlich [unless my reading has been of none effect, I should say 'ganz unnatürlich'] von ὀρῶ [έσσορῶ] ab, nicht von ἔκουνσαν.' [But certainly the well-nigh bedridden old man is in more need of a παράσειρος than the children.] If any one but the author of these notes can be satisfied with them—εὐνχοίη. The real interpretation of the passage, I think, though perhaps I too may be an 'unskillful physician,' is to be gathered from such passages as H. F. 631 sq. (ἄξω λαβὼν γε τοῦσδ' ἐφολκίδας χερσίν, | ναὺς δ' ὡς ἐφέλεξω), 1424 (Θησεὶ πανόλεις ἐφόμεσθ' ἐφολκίδες), Androm. 199 sq. (πότερον ἢ αὐτῇ παῖδας ἀντί σου τέκω | δούλους ἐμαντῇ τ' ἀθλίαν ἐφολκίδα). The figure then is drawn from the favourite province of Euripides—the sea. The children and the old man are ἐφολκίδες in the wake of Megara. (Cf. Wilamowitz' instructive note on H. F. 631.) But what shall we say to ὑπὸ σειραίοις ποσὶν? The adjective, I think, tells the story. It is just this element that keeps us (or kept the original hearers) from thinking of Megara's feet at all. ποσὶν here = πείσμασιν, as in Hec. 1019 sq. (καὶ γὰρ Ἀργεῖοι νεῶν | λίσσαι ποθοῦσιν οἰκάδ' ἐκ Τροίας πόδα), where πόδα seems pretty clearly meant = πρυμνήσιον πείσμα. The σείραιοι πόδες are, then, the lines that keep the ἐφολκίδες in tow, and ὑπὸ σ. π. ἔκουνσαν = ἐφέκουνσαν. With σειραίοις ποσὶν cf. the δέσμα σειραίων βρόχων with which Heracles is 'moored to a column' (ἀνήπτομεν πρὸς κίον) in v. 1009.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

PINDAR NEM. X. 5.

πολλὰ δ' Αἰγύπτῳ †κατόκισθεν† ἄσση ταῖς
Ἐπάφον παλάμαις.

A correction of this line which I proposed (Ἰὼ κτίσεν for κατόκισθεν) has been severely criticized on the score of metre. The requized arrangement is a very common metrical phrase in the *Odes*,—a dactylic tetrameter, invariably of this form:

— — — — —

and the conjecture in question introduces — — — — — for — — — — —. While I admit that there is a presumption against an emendation which assumes a metrical

irregularity of any kind in Pindar (because the total number of such irregularities in his extant works is so extremely small), and that there is a very strong presumption against an irregularity in this constantly recurring metre, I still think that Pindar might have made an exception in favour of a proper name. For observe. In such a metre as the following, Pindar does not admit a proceleusmatic:

πρόσθεν ἀκρεκόμα μυχθεῖσα Φοῖβῳ (Pyth. iii. 14).

But he relaxes his rule in behalf of a proper name:

ἔρνεϊ Τελεσιτάδα. τόλμα γὰρ εἰκός (*Isth.* iv. 63).

And, in general, he does not admit the resolution of the arsis (thesis) of a dactyl; but in *Nem.* vii. 70 we find Εὐξενίδα πάλτραθε, and in *Pyth.* xi. 9 Θέμιν ἰεράν. (Note that in *Pyth.* xi. 57 where the MSS. are divided between καλλίονα, which involves a proceleusmatic, and κάλλιον, we should read καλλίω, cp. αἰσχίω *Isth.* vi. 22.) Again in *Ol.* v. 18 we find a spondee where a dactyl is regular, for the sake of a proper name:

τιμὼν τ' Ἀλφεὼν εὐρὺν ῥέοντ' Ἰδαῖόν τε σεμνὸν
ἄντρον

In view of these facts, it seems possible that, where a proper name was concerned, a spondee might have taken the place of a dactyl in the metre of *Nem.* x. 5. I do not see that it would be impossible, like for instance a spondee in the second half of a pentameter.

But I wish to retract the conjecture 'Ιὼ κτίσεν, for I believe that I have found a restoration, which, while not open to any metrical objection, is in another respect superior. Ιὼ was the daughter of Inachus according to the best known legend (acc. to

another, daughter of Iasus). Cp. Aeschylus *Prom.* 590 τῆς Ἰναχίας, 705 Ἰναχεῖον σπέρμα, Sophocles, *El.* 4 Ἰνάχου κόρης. Read then:

πολλὰ δ' Αἰγύπτῳ κτίσεν Ἰναχίς ἄσση
ταῖς Ἐπάφου παλάμαις.

The corruption arose easily from the recurrence of the letters IC:

ΚΤΙC<ENINAXIC>

The falling out of these four syllables left

ΑΙΓΥΠΤΩΙΚΤΙCΑCΤΗ

and κατώκισθεν—a passive verb seemed called for as there was no trace of a nominative, other than ἄσση—was a natural emendation, which the required sense and perhaps the juxtaposition of the last letters of Αἰγύπτῳ easily suggested. The same considerations which I adduced to support 'Ιὼ support Ἰναχίς, but Ἰναχίς is better inasmuch as it introduces implicitly the name of Inachus, to whom Pindar was almost bound to make some reference in his brief record of early Argive history.—For the form Ἰναχίς, cp. Statius, *Theb.* xii. 303, Valerius Flaccus iv. 356.

J. B. BURY.

THE LEX SEMPRONIA AND THE BANISHMENT OF CICERO.

Τὸν δὲ (νόμον εἰσέφερε), εἰ τις ἄρχων ἄκριτον ἐκκεκρήνχοι πολίτην, κατ' αὐτοῦ δίδοντα κρίσιν τῷ δήμῳ. Such are the words in which Plutarch, *V. C. Gracch.* 4, describes a law passed by C. Gracchus, which has always been understood to have some connection with the lex Sempronia mentioned by Cicero as establishing the principle 'ne de capite civium Romanorum injussu populi judicaretur' (*pro Rabir.* 4, 12). The precise connection between these two passages has not however been clearly pointed out: and yet the manner in which we interpret the words of Plutarch is of some importance as throwing light on the procedure which led to the banishment of Cicero.

There can be no doubt that the words are a paraphrase of a Latin 'sanctio': and this we may hope to reconstruct with some success from the fortunate preservation of the 'sanctio' of a law of the Gracchan period, generally known as the 'lex Latina

tabulae Bantinae.' Arguing from this analogy, we may suppose the final clause of Gracchus' bill to have run somewhat as follows: 'Si cons. pr. et c. *senatorve* fecerit gesseritve, quo ex hac lege quae fieri oporteat minus fiant, quaeve ex hac lege facere oportuerit oportebitve non fecerit sciens dolo malo: seive adversus hanc legem fecerit sciens dolo malo—*poenam capitalem* *qui volet*¹ *magistratus inrogato*. The actual words of the law are of little importance, and, in spite of the fixed character of

¹ The words 'qui volet' must have occurred in every law that gave rise merely to a 'popularis actio,' e.g. 'ejusque pecuniae qui volet petitio esto' (*Lex Jul. Munic.* ll. 97, 125, 140); but in the *Tab. Bant.* (l. 9) we find the formula 'eam pecuniam qui volet magistratus exsigit' (cf. l. 11 'multam inrogare'). There is no reason why the latter formula should not have been used of other than monetary penalties: and a formula might be so worded as to assign jurisdiction both to the populus and to the plebs, see Festus s.v. *publica pondere* (p. 246 Müll.).

Roman legal formulae, cannot be restored. But that this was their gist the following considerations may help to show. It is probable that the *intentio* of the formula was as wide as that conjecturally given above, and covered senators as well as magistrates, for Gracchus' law was aimed at abolishing the 'quaestiones' which the senate claimed the right to establish, and Dio Cassius tells us (xxxviii. 14) that the first bill of Clodius was technically aimed as much against the senators who had advised, as against the magistrate who had carried out, the decree about the Catilinarian conspirators.¹ It is also probable that the *condemnatio* of the formula was as wide as that here given, for it is in the highest degree unlikely that C. Gracchus, the man who meant the tribunate to be the central power in the state, would have been content to rest the 'sanctio' of his great plebiscitum on the jurisdiction of the 'comitia centuriata,' which the tribune could not summon: more especially as the offence aimed at by the law might be interpreted as a violation of the 'leges sacrae.' Plutarch used the word *δημος*, which in Gracchus' law may have meant both 'populus' and 'plebs': but, if the *condemnatio* was narrower than that conjecturally given, then there can be little doubt that *δημος* in Gracchus' law meant 'plebs.' Nor can there be any doubt that the sentence proposed in the lex Sempronia was one involving 'caput.' It was based on the old principle of 'talio,' of such constant recurrence in Roman law, which found its fullest expression, although in a different context, in the Edict. But the words of the praetor 'qui magistratum potestatemve habebit, si quid in aliquem novi juris statuerit, ipse quandoque adversario postulante eodem jure uti debet' (Dig. 2, 2, 1, 1) were in spirit as applicable to the criminal as to the private law of Rome.

A political situation was then reached, which is not at all uncommon in states such as Rome where there is no 'constitutional law.' An act of parliament had been

passed which was in direct conflict with a charter: in this case the laws of the Twelve Tables which reserved capital trials to the centuries: and *ipso facto* the clause in this charter was obrogated. But we need not be surprised if the conservative party refused to admit this obrogation.

That this was the drift of the Sempronian law hardly admits of doubt, for Gracchus had put his own law into force (Cic. *pro domo*, 31, 82: 'ubi enim tuleras ut mihi aqua et igni interdiceretur? quod Gracchus de P. Popillio—tulit'). It was an attempt to reinforce it which directed Clodius' procedure in 58 B.C. For Rein is no doubt right in holding (*Criminalrecht*, p. 497) that the first bill of Clodius was not a definitive sentence of the tribes, but merely the threat of a trial. This may be gathered even more from the general behaviour of Clodius than from the particular statement of Appian (*B.C.* ii. 15), although we cannot afford to neglect the most fragmentary evidence about this constitutional struggle which comes to us from an unprejudiced source.

It is true that the real question of the legality of Cicero's exile turned on the validity of Clodius' second law. To Cicero and his friends it appeared a 'privilegium'; but the validity which Clodius attributed to it was intimately connected with his preliminary procedure and with the formal trial which this procedure threatened. If the plebs had jurisdiction in the case of an offence against C. Gracchus' law, then undoubtedly the tribune had the right of passing the formal bill of outlawry against one who had evaded trial by exile. This power had often been exercised before by the tribunes,² but it gained additional validity if we suppose that the law of C. Gracchus definitely contemplated a trial before the plebs as at least one of the modes of enforcing its sanction.

A. H. GREENIDGE.

¹ Senators are regarded as responsible officials in the Tab. Bant. (l. 7) and probably in the sanctions to Clodius' law (*Ad Att.* iii. 12, 1: iii. 15, 6).

² The instances are collected in Rein's *Criminalrecht*, p. 485 ff.; Rein believed that the tribunes always had the legal right of passing the formal bill of outlawry, although the jurisdiction of the tribes in capital cases was limited (p. 480).

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE *REPUBLIC* OF PLATO.

(Continued from p. 254.)

449 B. τί μάλιστα, ἔφη, ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀφίετε; Σέ, ἡ δ' ὅς. Ἐτι ἐγὼ εἶπον, τί μάλιστα;

The first τί μάλιστα should surely be τίνα μάλιστα. If μάλιστα occurs elsewhere only with the neuter of τίς, that must be mere accident. Ἐτι cannot, I think, be right; but ὅτι as a substitute is unsatisfactory.

449 D. μέγα γάρ τι οἰόμεθα φέρειν καὶ ὅλον εἰς πολιτείαν ὀρθῶς ἢ μὴ ὀρθῶς γιγνόμενον. Read γιγνομένην, agreeing with κοινωνίαν.

450 B. Μέτρον δέ γ', ἔφη, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὁ Γλαύκων, τοιούτων λόγων ἀκούειν ὅλος ὁ βίος νοῦν ἔχουσι. Read < τοῦ > τοιούτων λόγων ἀκούειν, or possibly < ὡς > τ. λ. ἀ. The cause of either omission is obvious.

450 E. ἐν γὰρ φρονίμοις τε καὶ φίλοις περὶ τῶν μεγίστων τε καὶ φίλων τάληθ' εἰδὼτα λέγειν ἀσφαλές καὶ θαρραλέον.

Perhaps φιλάτῳ, though φίλων may be defended as corresponding to φίλοις.

452 A. Μουσικὴ μὲν ἐκείνοις τε καὶ γυμναστικὴ ἐδόθη.

Both μέν and τε are here misused. Either μουσικὴ μὲν ἐκείνοις γε or ἐκείνοις μὲν < οὖν > μουσικὴ τε would give a good sense. As ἀποδίδωμι, and not the simple verb, is used over and over again in the context, and seems moreover the verb required, we should probably read ἀπεδόθη.

452 C. ἔδοκει αἰσχροὶ εἶναι καὶ γελοῖα... γυμνοὺς ἀνδρας ὁρᾶσθαι, καὶ ὅτε ἤρχοντο τῶν γυμνασίων πρῶτοι μὲν Κρήτες, ἔπειτα Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἐξήν κ. τ. λ. Herwerden has pointed out that τῶν γυμνασίων is not enough to express the idea intended, and has suggested τῶν < τοιούτων > γυμνασίων. It occurs to me as possible that Plato wrote τῶν < γυμνῶν > γυμνασίων, much as Pindar speaks (*Pyth.* 11, 73) of the γυμνὸν στάδιον. Just above (A, B) we have γυμνὰς... γυμναζομένας.

454 C. Socrates propounds the paradox that men and women ought to have the same occupations, and that difference of sex should not entail any difference of work. He then proposes to see what can be said on the other side. Surely (some one may say) such a system would be inconsistent with the great pervading and fundamental principle laid down by ourselves for our state, that different natures should have different kinds of work to do. Men and women evidently differ in nature: how then can it be right to set them both to the same work without making allowance for sex? This is

apparently a forcible argument; but it may be met (he continues) as follows. When we said that difference of nature should entail difference of work, of course we did not mean every conceivable natural difference, however trifling or however immaterial under the circumstances it might be. In a sense there is a difference of nature between a bald man and a man with a good head of hair. But no one would contend that, if bald men are engaged in the work of making shoes, men with plenty of hair are unfit for shoe-making and must have some other work found for them. The difference in the person which requires a difference in the employment is some really material difference bearing upon the employment in question, not a difference in some irrelevant respect. In his own words, τότε οὐ πάντως τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ τὴν ἑτέραν φύσιν ἐτιθέμεθα, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο τὸ εἶδος τῆς ἀλλοιώσεως τε καὶ ὁμοιώσεως μόνον ἐφυλάττομεν τὸ πρὸς αὐτὰ τείνον τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα. After some words apparently intended to illustrate what sameness and difference of nature really are, he goes on to say: If men and women really differ as regards employments, of course we must find different employments for them; but if the difference is purely one of sex, it does not follow that the same employments are not suitable for both. Now, as a matter of fact, there are no employments in which women are preeminent. Certain women may do certain things better than certain men; but, speaking generally, men excel women at everything, even at occupations deemed especially feminine. In a word, men are more εὐφρεῖς (455 B) for everything than women. Women therefore should have no especial work of their own, but do just the same things as men, only leaving to men those things or parts of things that require great bodily strength.

In all this argument, though perhaps not sound logically, there is no difficulty. The difficulty is in the words containing what seems meant as an illustration of sameness and difference in nature, and following immediately on the Greek words quoted above: οἷον ἱατρικὸν μὲν καὶ ἱατρικὴν τὴν ψυχὴν ὄντα τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν ἔχειν ἐλέγομεν ἢ οὐκ οἶε; Ἐγὼ γε. Ἱατρικὸν δὲ καὶ τεκτονικὸν ἄλλην; Πάντως ποῦ. For ἱατρικὸν the first hand in the Paris MS. known as A has ἱατρικῶν. On

ιατρικὴν τὴν ψυχὴν ὄντα Baiter's note is 'ιατρικὸν τὴν ψυχὴν ὄντα codices aliquot interpolati: ιατρικὴν τὴν ψυχὴν ὄντα accommodationis errore A: ιατρικὴν τὴν ψυχὴν ἔχοντα alii: ιατρικὴν (mulierem) τὴν ψυχὴν ὄντας H' (K. F. Hermann).

Hermann's reading cannot be right, because it assumes the very point that Socrates is concerned to prove—the identity of the male and female natures as regards a given occupation. Bekker's *ιατρόν* (adopted by Stallbaum) must be wrong, because there is no plausibility in identifying the *ιατρός* and the *ιατρικός*, the medical man and the man with a turn or taste for medicine. An *ιατρός* is not necessarily *ιατρικός*. There may seem more plausibility in *ιατρικὴν τὴν ψυχὴν ἔχοντα*, for the *ιατρικός* and the *ιατρικὴν τὴν ψυχὴν ἔχων* are indeed the same. But they are so completely and so obviously the same that their identity need not be stated, throws no light on the subject, and suggests no inference. Just the same may be said of *ιατρικὸν μὲν καὶ ιατρικὸν τὴν ψυχὴν ὄντα*. Schneider found a difference between the two men thus described, and Baiter, who gives this reading, presumably sees some difference also. But the two expressions mean just the same thing. We might of course say that *ιατρικός* referred to body as well as mind; but then the two men would be different, and Socrates could not say they were the same.

Let us try whether we cannot see for ourselves what Plato might naturally give as an instance to the point. An *ιατρικός* (he says) and a *τεκτονικός*, a man with a turn for medicine and one with a turn for carpentering, are different in nature; but an *ιατρικός* and x are in nature the same. What is x likely to be? An *ιατρικός*, I think, who has some characteristic which does not alter his *ιατρικὴ φύσις* into something else, or some characteristic which has no bearing upon it of any kind. Socrates might, for instance, keeping his former illustration, have said that an *ιατρικός* and a *τεκτονικός* were different, but an *ιατρικός* and an *ιατρικός* with a bald head the same, that is, the same for the purposes of *ιατρική*, the same when you were considering what employment to put them to. This is only one illustration among many that might be imagined: but it seems probable that Plato here mentioned some species of *ιατρικός*, saying that an *ιατρικός* and an *ιατρικός* of such and such a kind were for our purpose the same, while men with different bents were for our purpose different.

I believe however that we can go further than this and fix with some probability on the precise word that is missing. Plato

probably wrote *ιατρικὸν μὲν καὶ ιατρικὸν <εὐφύα> τὴν ψυχὴν ὄντα*. *Εὐφύης*, which the hearers of Socrates would think he used casually and without ulterior object, is exactly the right word to lead up to the subsequent argument founded on the *εὐφύα* of men. If *εὐφύα*, added to a natural bent or fitness, does not alter the nature of it, then men and women, who only differ in *εὐφύα* (455 B—D), have not that difference of nature which calls for a difference of employment. But while there is this intrinsic fitness about the word *εὐφύης* if inserted here, it also seems distinctly implied in 455 B that the word *εὐφύης* has already been used in the course of this particular argument. The passage runs thus: *Βούλει οὖν δεῶμεθα τοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀντιλέγοντος ἀκολουθεῖν ἡμῖν, εἴν πως ἡμεῖς ἐκεῖν ἔνδειξόμεθα ὅτι οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἐπιτήδευμα ἰδίων γυναικὶ πρὸς διοίκησιν πόλεως; Πάνν γε. Ἴθι δὴ, φησόμεν πρὸς αὐτόν, ἀποκρίνουν. Ἄρα οὕτως ἔλεγες τὸν μὲν εὐφύα πρὸς τι εἶναι, τὸν δὲ ἀφύα, ἐν ᾧ ὁ μὲν ῥαδίως τι μαρθάνει, ὁ δὲ χαλεπῶς κ.τ.λ.* The imperfect *ἔλεγες* must refer to something said, implied, or meant in a former passage. Now the imaginary objector (*ὁ ἀντιλέγων*) has not actually been supposed to speak before, but Socrates has done it for him (453 A), and the reference in *ἔλεγες* can only be to something that has been said between 453 A and 455 B. Within these limits the word *εὐφύης* is not used nor hinted at, as the text stands; but, if inserted before *τὴν ψυχὴν ὄντα*, it would make *ἔλεγες* perfectly intelligible. There is another imperfect in the very sentence I am proposing to emend (*οἷον ιατρικὸν μὲν καὶ ιατρικὸν <εὐφύα> τὴν ψυχὴν ὄντα τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν ἔχειν ἐλέγομεν*) which at first sight tells against the proposal. It too refers to something preceding, and seems at first sight to say that the proposition (whatever it may be) has already been laid down. But *ἐλέγομεν* does not really mean as much as this. It only means 'when we talked of natures different and the same, we meant for instance that an *ιατρικός* and x were the same in nature, while an *ιατρικός* and a *τεκτονικός* were different.' It would of course be easy to read *λέγομεν* for *ἐλέγομεν*, but *ἐλέγομεν* will bear this meaning and there is no occasion for change.

Perhaps it may be thought that the *ιατρικός* and the *ιατρικός εὐφύης τὴν ψυχὴν ὄν* are not clearly distinct persons—any more than, as I have argued above, the *ιατρικός* and the *ιατρικός τὴν ψυχὴν*. I am not sure whether *εὐφύα*, if right, refers to general or special ability and fitness, but in either case there is a clear difference between the two men.

In the first case a man may have some turn and taste for medicine without being an able man. This is a matter of common experience. In the second case the *ιατρικός* and the *εὐφυής* πρὸς τὴν *ιατρικὴν* differ as the positive and superlative degrees of comparison differ: they differ as the politician from the statesman, and the poetaster from the poet.

For *εὐφυής τὴν ψυχὴν ὥν* compare 409 E τοὺς μὲν *εὐφύεις* τὰ σώματα καὶ τὰς ψυχάς: 491 E τὰς ψυχὰς...τὴν *εὐφυστάτας*: and other passages.

Finally, some slight confirmation of the proposal to insert *εὐφῶ* may perhaps be found in Aristotle, who writes in *Met.* 3. 1. 1003 b 1, distinguishing various senses of *ιατρικός*, as follows: τὸ μὲν γὰρ τῷ ἔχειν τὴν *ιατρικὴν* λέγεται *ιατρικόν*, τὸ δὲ τῷ εὐφύειν εἶναι πρὸς αὐτὴν, τὸ δὲ τῷ ἔργον εἶναι τῆς *ιατρικῆς*. The distinction between τὸ ἔχειν τὴν *ιατρικὴν* and τὸ εὐφύειν εἶναι πρὸς *ιατρικὴν* is apparently not the same as that I suppose to be drawn by Plato, but Aristotle is so often indebted to Plato, even for his illustrations, that he might very well be thinking of the passage before us. On the other hand, his use of the words may be pure accident, as he is always fond of illustrations drawn from medicine.

454 D. *ἐὰν μὲν πρὸς τέχνην τινα ἢ ἄλλο ἐπιτήδευμα διαφέρων φαίνεται*. Read *διαφέρειν*, as in the next sentence. *Διαφέρον* cannot be used of two subjects, though of course *διαφέροντα* might be.

455 D. 'Αληθῆ, ἔφη, λέγεις, ὅτι πολὺν κρατεῖται ἐν ἅπασιν, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, τὸ γένος τοῦ γένους.

Unless some other example can be given of *κρατεῖσθαι* with a genitive, *κρατεῖ* for *κρατεῖται* would seem probable.

457 C. Φήσεις γε . . . , ὅταν τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο ἴδῃς. Λέγε δὴ, ἴδω, ἔφη. To get rid of a construction most unlikely to occur in Plato, Cobet suggested *Φέρε δὴ, ἴδω, ἔφη*. More like the MS. reading would be 'Αγε δὴ.

459 C. Where medicine is not needed, *ιατρὸν*...καὶ φαυλότερον ἔξαρκεῖν ἡγοῦμεθα: ὅταν δὲ δὴ καὶ φαρμακεῦεν δὲ, ἴσμεν ὅτι ἀνδρείστερον δεῖ τὸν *ιατροῦ*.

Ἀνδρείστερον seems a quite unsuitable word. In contrast to *φαυλότερον* we want some word to express competence and skill, as in Juvenal's 'curentur dubii medicis maioribus aegri.' Even if *ἀνδρείστερον* could mean 'more of a man,' it would be very questionable here. Perhaps what Plato wrote was ἴσμεν ὅτι αὐτὸν δριμύτερον δεῖ τοῦ *ιατροῦ*. For *δριμύς* in the sense of 'shrewd,' 'acute,' cf. ὡς δριμύν βλέπει τὸ ψυχάριον (519 A): *δριμύτητα*...δεῖ αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὰ μαθήματα

ὑπάρχειν (535 B): *ἐννοιαι καὶ δριμύεις* (*Theaet.* 173 A).

462 C. Ἐν ᾗτιν δὴ πόλει πλείστοι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ ταῦτα τοῦτο λέγουσι τὸ ἐμὸν καὶ τὸ οὐκ ἐμὸν, αὕτη ἀριστα διοικεῖται;

Read ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ, for the accusative is not Greek. Cf. 470 B: 493 C: 559 A.

466 E. ἵνα...θεῶνται ταῦτα, ἃ τελεσθέντας δεῖσει δημιουργεῖν: πρὸς δὲ τῇ θέᾳ διακοινεῖν καὶ ὑπηρετεῖν πάντα τὰ περὶ τὸν πόλεμον. I do not think the infinitives can be accounted for by anything understood. Perhaps we should insert something like *διδάσκωνται* before *διακοινεῖν*.

467 C. Ἀλλὰ σμικρὸν οἶε διαφέρειν καὶ οὐκ ἄξιον κινδύνου κ.τ.λ. Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ διαφέρει πρὸς ὃ λέγεις.

Perhaps ἀλλὰ <πολὺν> διαφέρει οἱ <μέγα> διαφέρει.

Ibid. Τοῦτο μὲν ἄρα ὑπαρκτέον, θεωρῶνς πολέμου τοὺς παῖδας ποιεῖν, προσμηχανᾶσθαι δ' αὐτοῖς ἀσφάλειαν, καὶ καλῶς ἔξει.

Προσμηχανᾶσθαι cannot be taken as parallel to *ποιεῖν*, for both μὲν and the sense of *ὑπαρκτέον* forbid this. But it follows that we must either read *προσμηχανητέον*, or insert something like *δεῖσει*.

468 A. Τί δὲ δὴ, εἶπον, τὰ περὶ τὸν πόλεμον; πῶς ἐκτέον σοι τοὺς στρατιώτας πρὸς αὐτοὺς τε καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους; ἄρα ὁρθῶς μοι καταφαίνεται ἢ οὐ; Λέγ', ἔφη, ποῖ ἂν (ποῖ ἂν A).

The ordinary punctuation seems to be at fault. Read τὰ περὶ τὸν πόλεμον, πῶς ἐκτέον κ.τ.λ., ἄρα ὁρθῶς μοι καταφαίνεται ἢ οὐ; In λέγ', ἔφη, ποῖ ἂν, which can hardly be right, ἂν looks like the not uncommon corruption of δὴ. Cf. 469 B τί δέ, πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους πῶς ποιήσουσιν ἡμῖν οἱ στρατιῶται; Τὸ ποῖον δὴ;

469 A. Διαπυθόμενοι ἄρα τοῦ θεοῦ, πῶς χρὴ τοὺς δαιμονίους τε καὶ θεοὺς τιθέναι καὶ τίνι διαφόρῳ, οὕτω καὶ ταύτῃ θήσομεν ἢ ἂν ἐξηγήται;

Read <θήκη> τίνι διαφόρῳ, comparing *Λαίω* 947 B τελευτήσασιν δὲ προθέσεις τε καὶ ἐκφορὰς καὶ θήκας διαφόρους εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν.

470 B. Φαίνεται μοι, ὥσπερ καὶ ὀνομάζεται δύο ταῦτα ὀνόματα, πόλεμος τε καὶ στάσις, οὕτω καὶ εἶναι δύο, ὄντα ἐπὶ δυοῖν τινοῖν διαφοραῖν. λέγω δὲ τὰ δύο, τὸ μὲν οἰκεῖον καὶ συγγενές, τὸ δὲ ἄλλότριον καὶ ὀθνεῖον.

It is clear, I think, that the words have got slightly out of their proper order and should run thus: ὥσπερ καὶ ὀνομάζεται δύο ταῦτα ὀνόματα, πόλεμος τε καὶ στάσις, ὄντα ἐπὶ δυοῖν τινοῖν διαφοραῖν, οὕτω καὶ εἶναι δύο. [Or ὄντα...διαφοραῖν may follow ὀνόματα.] ὄντα ἐπὶ can only refer to names, not to things.

471 C, D. In the very awkward sentence

beginning with ἐπεὶ ὅτι γε I cannot but think ὁμολογῶ, or some similar word, should be inserted after ἢ γένοιτο. Its omission might be due to the λέγω occurring almost immediately after.

472 D. Οἷε ἂν οὖν ἦττόν τι ἀγαθὸν ζωγράφον εἶναι κ.τ.λ. Read οἷε δὴ οὖν. Cf. *Class. Rev.* vi. 340.

473 C. Ἐπ' αὐτὸ δὴ, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, εἰμι ὃ τῷ μεγίστῳ προσεικάζομεν κύματι. εἰρήσεται δ' οὖν, εἰ καὶ μέλλει γέλῳτι τε ἀτεχνῶς ὥσπερ κύμα ἐκγελῶν καὶ ἀδοξία κατακλύσειν.

But Socrates does not go to the wave: it is the wave which approaches and threatens to deluge him. Cf. 472 A τὸ μέγιστον καὶ χαλεπώτατον τῆς τρικυμίας ἐπάγεις. [Is Baiter's ἐνάγεις a misprint?]

Read ἐπ' αὐτῷ δὴ...εἰμι ὃ κ.τ.λ. For the error cf. note on 462 C above: for the construction cf. 490 D ἐπὶ τούτῳ νῦν γεγόναι, τί ποθ' οἱ πολλοὶ κακοί: 506 D μὴ...ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τέλει ὦν ἀποστής: 532 B ἐπ' αὐτῷ γίγνεται τῷ τοῦ νοητοῦ τέλει: *Polit.* 274 B οὐ δὴ ἕνεκα ὃ λόγος ὤρμηκε πᾶς, ἐπ' αὐτῷ νῦν ἐσμὲν ἡδὴ: *Soph. O. T.* 1169 οἶμοι, πρὸς αὐτῷ γ' εἰμι τῷ δεινῷ λέγειν.

'Εκγελῶν also may fairly be regarded with great suspicion. The only parallel cited for such a use of the word is in reality no parallel at all. In *Eur. Tro.* 1176, when the remains of the young Astyanax are brought to Hecuba, she speaks of his curly head, ἔσθην ἐκγελᾷ ὁστέων ραγύντων φόνος, ἢ αἰσχρὰ μὴ λέγω. But it is quite clear that ἐκγελᾷ there refers to the appearance of what

Shakspere calls 'bright hair dabbled in blood,' and not to any violent rush of blood now taking place. The time for any such rush of blood is gone by. 'Εκγελᾷν there gives therefore no support to ἐκγελᾶν here, and it remains to be shown that ἐκγελᾶν could be used of a bursting wave. Observe further the great infelicity of combining in the same phrase γέλως in a literal and ἐκγελᾶν in a figurative sense.

In *Soph. Phil.* 1149-50 Professor Jebb has very happily emended φονγᾶ μ' οὐκέτ' ἀπ' αὐλίων πελάτε by reading μηκέτι...πηδάτε, and it seems possible that we should in like manner read ἐκπηδῶν here (ἘΚΠΗΔΩΝ for ἘΚΤΕΑΩΝ). Compare such expressions as *Virg. Aen.* xi. 624 'alternò procurrens gurgite pontus': *Ov. Fast.* iii. 591 'assiliunt fluctus': Tennyson's *Coming of Arthur* 'the fringe | of that great breaker, sweeping up the strand, | lash'd at the wizard, as he spake the word.'

'Εκπηδῶν occurs 495 D: *Tim.* 68 A ἐκπηδῶντος πυρός.

473 D. καὶ τοῦτο εἰς ταῦτόν ξυμπέσῃ, δυνάμεις τε πολιτικὴ καὶ φιλοσοφία. Surely τοῦτο should be ταῦτα.

474 E. μελιχλῶρους δὲ καὶ τοῦνομα οἷε τινὸς ἄλλου ποίημα εἶναι ἢ ἐραστοῦ κ.τ.λ. Obviously μελιχλῶρον.

479 C. τῷ τῶν παίδων αἰνίγματι τῷ περὶ τοῦ εἰνοῦχον τῆς βολῆς περὶ τῆς νυκτερίδος. Should not the first περὶ be omitted?

HERBERT RICHARDS.

THE REMOTE DELIBERATIVE.

In the December No. of the *C.R.* 1892 I put forward some reasons for refusing a place in our grammars to the Remote Deliberative. Mr. Sidgwick, its author, has received my criticisms in a most courteous and liberal spirit, in a paper which appeared in the *C.R.* for March of this year. In his reply while admitting the exceptional character of this idiom and its restriction to the Attic Dramatists—an admission which seems scarcely to tally with its classification as a distinct syntactical construction—he still contends for the principle and brings forward further proofs which may be summed up under the two following heads:—

(1) The instances of indirect Remote Deliberative under discussion being all, it is urged, 'negative or, what comes to the same

thing, interrogative, and the oblique Deliberative being far more frequently found in the negative form,' it follows that 'in cases of disputed optative, when we find they are all in the negative form this is an additional argument in favour of their being Deliberative.'

(2) Further examples of Remote Deliberative are forthcoming.

It may first be observed that the inference arrived at under No. 1 is not strictly conclusive. At most it can only afford a certain degree of probability, seeing that the second premise is admittedly not universally true. But even this probability is considerably weakened when we find that the other premise is of a somewhat dubious character. All these disputed instances of indirect Deliberative can only be said to be

negative in so far as interrogative and negative come to the same thing. Now this is not the case. It is true that many interrogatives are virtual negatives; it may also be true that every negative can be thrown into the form of an interrogative; but it is not true that all interrogatives are logically identical with negatives. Else what would be the use of the distinction in Latin between *num* and *nonne*? And is it not correct to say that many questions are put merely for information? When Apollo inquires ἐσθ' οὖν ὅπως Ἀλκίσις ἐς γῆρας μάλοι; we must refer to the context to see whether he is not simply putting a real question. On referring to the passage it will be seen that this is so. Again Mr. Sidgwick himself admits that the lines τίς τῶνδε δαμμάτων ἔχει κράτος | ὅστις ξένους δέξαιτο; contain merely a request for information. Hence two of the disputed instances are neither negative nor affirmative; but if not negative Mr. Sidgwick's first premise would seem to be inaccurate. The value of the second statement quoted above—that indirect Deliberatives are generally preceded by negatives—may be gauged from the fact that an important class of verbs, e.g. βουλεύομαι, ἀπορῶ, ἐρωτῶ, χρηστηριάζομαι (Herodt.), are almost invariably affirmative when followed by Deliberative clauses. The common idea underlying this class of verbs and indeed all expressions after which an indirect Deliberative occurs, is lack of clear vision, state of perplexity, absence of knowledge. When this notion is conveyed through the instrumentality of verbs like οἶδα, ὁρῶ, a negative becomes necessary. One would scarcely look for the result of deliberative effort to a person who has just uttered the word οἶδα. It matters little whether indirect Deliberatives with a preceding negative are numerically preponderant or not, since the essential element in all these cases is not the negative form but the *mens haerens*. Hence if it could be established that the instances under discussion are negative, this would of itself prove nothing, unless it be further shown that expression is also given to the τὸ ἀπορὸν or *no thoroughfare in counsel* which is essential in all Deliberatives.

Let us now turn to the further examples adduced.¹ The *primary* to which these are referred is οὐ γὰρ ἄλλον οἶδ' ὅσῳ λέγω. Mr. Sidgwick takes much pains to establish this as a case of indirect Deliberative. It seems to me there should be no difficulty in regarding it as an example of what gram-

marians term *antiptosis* or what others would call *prolepsis*. In other words we have here a case of anticipation in the principal clause of a word which should more naturally occur in the subordinate clause. It is an extension of such well-known forms of expression as οἶδα σὲ ὅστις εἶ, *Lesbonicum quaero ubi habitat*. The instances quoted as analogous to the foregoing and put forward as Remote Deliberatives must, it seems to me, be classified as final clauses, being but the historic sequence of:

οὐχ ὁρῶν οὐδέν' ὅστις ἀρκέσει
οὐκ ἔχων τινα ὃς κατενάσσει
οὐδέν' ἔχω ὅστις ἀγγελεῖ.

As regards their final character I have the support of the independent testimony of Prof. Tarbell and Mr. M. L. Earle,² who cite these very passages as instances of their 'Greek Relative of Purpose.'

Of course the future indicative is more commonly retained even after an historic tense on Mr. Sidgwick's well-known canon of 'greater vividness.' Examples however of change to the optative do occur, as may be gathered from the following parallel passages:

Soph. *Ajax* 658-9 κρίνω τοδ' ἔγχεσ
ἐνθα μὴ τις ὀψεται.

Id. *Tr.* 903 κρίψας' ἐαντὴν ἐνθα μὴ τις
εἰσίδου.³

I may now be permitted to answer the question with which Mr. Sidgwick neatly sums up the point at issue in this discussion: 'Given an exceptional Attic use,' he asks, 'what are its grammatical affinities in the normal usages?' These affinities, I venture to submit, are to be found in such instances as the following:

Plato *Rep.* 352 E ἐσθ' ὅτῳ ἂν ἄλλῳ ἴδοις
ἢ ὀφθαλμοῖς;

Soph. *Phil.* 1309 οὐκ ἐσθ' ὅτον ὁργὴν ἔχουσ
ἂν.

Eur. *El.* 224 οὐκ ἐσθ' ὅτον θέγοιμ' ἂν
ἐνδικώτερον.

Eur. *Alc.* 80 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φίλων πέλας οὐδεὶς
| ὅστις ἂν εἴποι.

On these I may briefly observe:

(1) They are all negative or quasi-negative—a point which Mr. Sidgwick regards as essential in his indirect Remote Deliberative.

² Vide *C.R.* July 1891 and March 1892.

³ Cf. Xen. *Hell.* 2, 3, 11. Plut. *Caes.* c. 5. Theocr. 23, 3; 25, 219.

¹ Soph. *Phil.* 279 and 605. Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 588.

(2) The example from Plato involves a question decidedly remote from the practical.

Thus we have here verified two of the chief tests which go to establish a Remote Deliberative.

There is one example of an optative without *ἂν*, occurring in Aeschylus (*Eum.* 265), which deserves attention. It was cited in my last paper but unfortunately placed among instances drawn from non-Attic sources, which perhaps accounts for its having been apparently overlooked. The passage referred to is:

ἀπὸ δὲ σοῦ
φεροίμαν βόσκαν πόματος δυσπτόου.

This may be regarded as equivalently potential.¹ The context appears to me to favour this interpretation. The Furies would scarcely wish for what was already theirs. They are not indulging in wishes, but gloating over their coming ghastly meal.

One word more. Mr. Sidgwick seems to confine this theory to Attic Greek. Considering the examples adduced there is no reason why Theocritus should be excluded. *τί φίλος ῥέξαιμι*; (*Theocr.* 27, 25) is as much a Remote Deliberative as *τίς κατάσχοι*;

In conclusion I must thank Mr. Sidgwick—whose scholarship all students appreciate—for his candid consideration of suggestions for the emendation of so widely received a theory. J. D.

¹ The fact that the reading *φεροίμα' ἂν* has been suggested confirms the view here taken.

[By the kindness of the editor I have seen J. D.'s reply in proof, and am permitted to make a few comments. I must be excused for confining myself to the main points.

1. The 'negative' argument. In seeking

to classify sentences like *οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις κείραιτο* I compared them with the indisputable deliberatives *οὐκ ἔχω ὅ τι εἶπω*, *οὐκ εἶχον ὅ τι εἶποιμι*, of which one common feature is that they are negative. Thus you do not usually find *ἔχω ὅ τι εἶπω*, *ᾗδεν ὅ τι εἶποιμι*, for the reason (which I gave, and which is obvious) that it is 'embarrassment' or *τὸ ἄπορον*, as J. D. calls it, which is a mark of the deliberative. This is all that my argument requires, and to this I adhere: but I admit that in stating it I seemed to ignore the common *positive* deliberatives after *βουλεύω* &c., and I am grateful to J. D. for correcting my oversight.

2. The 'further examples.' J. D. regards sentences of the type *οὐδένα εἶχον ὅστις ἀγγεῖλαι* as *final relatives*, quoting the well-known *ἐνθα μὴ τις εἰσέλθοι* (which has no exact parallel in Attic, and which is very difficult to be sure of). The objection to this classification is that it separates *οὐδένα εἶχον ὅστις ἀγγεῖλαι* from *οὐκ εἶχον ὅ τι δράσαιμι*. Nor is it satisfactory to call *ὅστις ἀγγεῖλαι* *historic sequence* of *ὅστις ἀγγελεῖ*. Historic sequence of a future cannot be an aorist. And if J. D. replies that the *meaning* is *practically final*, I rejoin that the *form* comes by development from the *deliberative*: which is my contention all along.

The defects of J. D.'s theory are best seen by a tabular statement:

{	<i>οὐκ ᾗδεν ὅστις ἀγγεῖλαι</i> he calls <i>deliberative</i> .
	<i>οὐδένα εἶχον ὅστις ἀγγεῖλαι</i> he calls <i>final</i> .
	<i>οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις ἀγγεῖλαι</i> he calls <i>potential</i> without <i>ἂν</i> .

Surely I am justified in saying that such classification *disregards affinity*.

Let me again thank J. D. for the aid he has given toward a better understanding of this subject: and personally also for the great courtesy of his rejoinder.

A. SIDGWICK.]

THE LATIN GALLIAMBIC METRE.

I WAS wrong no doubt in so expressing myself (*Class. Rev.* vii. p. 145) as to make it appear that I denied any *historical connexion* between Catullus' galliambics and an Ionic a minore metre. It can be made out that the one is the lineal descendant of the other. But so likewise is 'Needy knife-grinder, whither art thou going?' the lineal descendant of

ποικιλόθρον' ἀθάνατ' Ἀφροδίτα.

And yet any one who should endeavour to analyse the actual effect of the English line might find its antecedents misleading. As to the galliambic metre, my point was that in Catullus' hands it was so transformed that for musical purposes it was best explained without any reference to its Ionic origin. The case appears to me to stand thus. The pure Ionic measure is

♪ ♪ | ♪ ♪ ♪ | ♪ ♪ ♪

clearly in $\frac{3}{4}$ time. When the Ionics are 'broken' we have



which is in $\frac{6}{8}$ time.

The Greek lyric poets who employed one of these forms as a variation on the other resorted to a device by no means infrequent in modern music, where we find bars of $\frac{3}{4}$ time intruding in a passage of $\frac{6}{8}$ time, or *vice versa*. Many a well-known waltz shows what is practically the same feature, the melody having three equal beats in two bars. In the waltz the two rhythms are, by means of the accompaniment, kept going simultaneously. The Greeks did not do this, but used the two rhythms alternatively. Thus Anacreon, after beginning *ἀγε δῆντε μῆκεθ' οὐτῶ* in $\frac{6}{8}$ time, winds up with *ὑποπίνοντες ἐν ὕμνοις* in $\frac{3}{4}$ time; while conversely Aeschylus (*Persae* 65 sqq.), after well establishing the $\frac{3}{4}$ rhythm

πεπέρακεν μὲν ὁ περσέπολις ἦδη,

winds up the second and later strophes in $\frac{6}{8}$ time

ἀνδράσι τοξόδαμον Ἄρη.

In all these cases there is an effect of syncopation. That is to say, we are conscious of two rhythms at once; we hear one and we remember another. But is there any syncopation in Catullus' metre? I cannot see it at all; the whole piece goes in $\frac{6}{8}$ time; and I must say it does seem to me absurd to explain a metre as depending on an effect of syncopation, that is, a conflict of times, when the ear is never reminded of any other time to conflict with the one before it. I think that Catullus felt syncopation to be unsuitable to the genius of Latin verse; perhaps indeed it was only possible in a language in which the time-sense was so delicate as it was in Greek. He got his effect of tumult by a quite other device, a device eminently congenial to his language, namely the collision between the accent and the ictus in the last half of the line which I endeavoured to point out in my last paper. As for Varro I think it very likely that he did try to write galliambics on the Greek model. He was an experimenter in metre, as we know (Cic. *Acad.* i. § 9 and J. S. Reid there).

E. S. THOMPSON.

ILIAD BOOK X.

In Mr. Platt's benevolent review of my *Homer and the Epic*, I think he misunderstands one passage of the work. About *Iliad* x. he says that I 'faintly defend it, on the ground that "if it were possible to foist a whole book into the sacred text of Homer, then it would also be possible to foist many others".' 'Is this fair argument?' Mr. Platt asks. It is not argument at all, it is a statement of fact. If Book x. is an interpolation, the interpolation of other books, as of xxiii. xxiv., was possible. A point is scored by me, not to my view, but to that of the Separatists. I meant to acknowledge that it is so, if we reject Book x. When my book was finished Mr. Monro wrote to me the letter quoted in Appendix B. 'Simple interpolation' (as of Book x.) 'is one thing, complex interpolation, involving many minute changes, is another.' So I express the effect made on my mind by Mr. Monro's remarks. Take away Book x. and you do not alter the plot. Add it, and you add nothing requiring alteration in the plot. I do not

'throw over' the book in my note, nor do I defend it in the body of the work, because 'it opens the door to the general theory of complex interpolation.' I do not care what the consequences of its rejection or admission may be. If its rejection is good for the Separatists, so be it; if good reasons for rejecting it are adduced. But Mr. Monro suggests that, if the Book was interpolated, it supplies no argument for *complex* interpolation, and I cite his opinion. My only wish is to argue in a sportsmanlike manner, and I did not mean to defend the Book because its rejection would be inconvenient, but to score a point to my adversaries, if there are good reasons for rejecting the book. Mr. Platt has inferred that my intentions were different, that 'we are not to confess to this interpolation, for fear we should have to give up our cherished prepossession.' I would confess it if I were convinced of it, and would take the consequences—the consequences which I point out—but I am not convinced.

A. LANG.

B B 2

COLLATION OF THE MADRID MS. OF MANILIUS (M. 31 BIBL. NAZION.)
WITH THE TEXT OF JACOB, BERLIN, 1846.

(Continued from page 311.)

294 nouissima *marg.* notissima 295 inm.
296 helicen m. d. arcid'm¹ *marg.* arcum
298 graia 302 querentibus 305 Nas (a
large miniated N) 307 asdibus *marg.* a
sedibus umquam 308 sydera 309
nicencia, then lucencia, *i.e.* changed by elon-
gating first stroke of n 310 ~~ail~~ airibus (*sic*)
311 Hinc uicena caeli hinc proxima flam-
mis *marg.* solo hinc caeli, which has been
scratched through and poli celique hinc sub-
stituted above 314 regentem 317 sim-
ililis iunctis instat 321 in media radiat
que m. frunte 323 Gnosia de sertae
fulgent monimenta p. 324 deductis inter
325 coeprat 325 actigerat 330 inm.
331 Ingentem magnis orpheu de nomine
signis. Over magnis is written *P*, and in
the left *marg.* nō ophiucus 332 Dinidit
et toto ingentem c. corpus, in the right
marg. cingentem. But ingentem has, be-
fore g, a superscribed ' (= mergentem): pos-
sibly this ' is later.² 333 Explicet
ut 335 Et dedit 336 Semper erit
paribus bellum quia uiribus equant 338
Inp. 339 deus inimicum (*sic*), in left
marg. niueum. A different correction in
right *marg.* in mutum i. raucum has been
scratched through 340 plurima 341
deductas 342 Adsudet et uolitans gestet
ceu f. mundi 347 Octaui, with * written
above later 348 diuo forequus cprendre
349 claris³ 350 andromeda quā perseus
armis 351 Et ripit et sociat sibi 352
quod tercia lampada dispas *marg.* dispar
353 de/ toto 354 casieppa. After this
v. follow 399-442 355 iuxtaque relictam
356 Andromedā u. metuentem piscis hiatus
358 Ne 360 testemque 361 nexo
362 studioque, then que erased 363 primo
alto 365 (duclai)⁴ (*sic*) eludentes sidera
366 Nubilis 371 Pleiadesque vadesque⁵
(*sic*) utraque 372 Inboream scen-

¹ Conceivably this was meant for arcum, *i.e.* u
with v written over it.

² Thus, in'gentem. It is hard to say whether the '
by which the word is converted into mergentem, is
original: the ink of it is as black as the rest of the
word.

³ Perhaps for clarens?

⁴ Possibly dudai.

⁵ This looks as if the original MS. wrote v for y.

dunt 375 capricorni siciubet (l) axem:
in *marg.* a later hand and ink has written
sidus et 378 Ignoteque h. g's 380
leuaque 383 in orbe 389 s. ad sidera
passu 390 fulgentis umeros (^h has
been added before ^uumeros) 392 exesso
marg. excelso (later ink) immensus 393
signantur 398 Nec grauius cedit nec
orrida frigore s. 399 Ne uacuum 401
qui 402 exelso 404 ualundo changed
to ualitudo 408 herens 409 ceruleo
410 Caetera 412 prochion tum nobilis
414 acta 416 mitantur *marg.* imitatur
417 et una iaccho 418 Crater et
a later hand has added qui before et 419
conmissus 420 hic 421 gigantas 422
tumidi quoque 424 Ques. esurcione⁶ for
dubitauit 426 adgressos (later g written
over d) 427 colles 428 inportantis
et 429 uultu corpor^a partus (^a coeval)
430 Needum hostiferum sibi quaequā numina
norant 431 maiora suis orauit et are (so
the original hand: a corrector in the *marg.*
has written arce for are, and a different and
later hand tunc iuppiter axe) 433 Quam-
propter coept^vys (*i.e.* coetos) squamea
434 tortis 435 Intaentans similem mor-
sum 439 exurgit 440 ingentis giros
441 Alterius 443 latentes 446 nocia
(*marg.* oeuca) 448 innexa 449 con-
spectū 450 similisque 453 quamuis
fulgentia uisus 454 Hunc orbem celi uer-
tentis sidera cursu 455 pingit 459 aut
changed to ut 460 D. nichil et uacuum
qua lumine cessit 464 Succ. oneris (*sic*)
disiungeret autum changed to -gere tan-
tum 467 mediae 469 Prec. impl.
470 luyina (*sic*) conditur 480 nihil ullis
partibus errayt (n slightly scratched through)
481 Partibus et (laxius margin) After
482 DE AETERNITATE MVNDI 488 E quis
489 inm. 490 constare 493 celoque
creatum 495 Ad cur 496 praescripto⁶
(*sic*) credere 498 aestinas (u in pale ink)
501 graia euertent per magna *marg.* per-
gama 502 Arctos 508 Quod 509 Quod

⁶ Perhaps for extrudere, which is written in the
right margin.

512 gracia 514 Lustrari 516 terra euer-
tentibus annos 517 L(I)unariam exutam
g's 518 Ad 521 fuit isdem
522 aliumue 523 euo (but before e a
letter has been erased) 529 terram Then
DE PARALLELIS CIRCVLIS Then 566 Circulus
ad boreā 567 aceli partes 571 Aesti-
uom 576 spera olimpum 577 lumine
578 Componit 581 filia marg. fila 582
nomine timens 586 loce 587 ca^dentem
(sic) 590 astrinu (sic) qui stringet 591
Hinc 592 anro, altered later to anro, i.e. a
nostro 594 partis 595 summā olim-
phum 596 signantis t. fines 597 Hiis-
cadem (marg. his eadem) 598 equant
599 Quando uidiem sexto 601 Inter ualla
seruantis 602 fines 603 a uertice
uertice (sic): uertex has been written
in a paler ink and another hand over the
second uertice 606 polo rerto (sic,
corrected in marg. to rectum) 609 olim-
pho 610 Serpentis After 611
follows 530 Sed dimensa suis 532 Hac
geritur 535 his ē tecta tenetur 536 ia-
centis 538 caelumque uersumque After
538 DE LATITVDINE ET MAGNITVDINE MYNDI
ET SIGNORUM 539 olimpho 541 rano
542 inmente 543 subcumbunt 545
quarumque 547 sed solidam 549 Astra
bis senis 551 summo ignis 552 Hac
geritur 553 Que queque 554 sex
tante 557 Nec 559 Signa cum
After 560 DE CIRCVLIS CAELESTIBVS:-DE COL-
VRIS 561 cones 562 cōmitantia 564
Circulus 565 arcophilaca petens 565^b
Tangit et origenen chelaram summa regidit¹
567 a om. After 567 follows 612
serans hidram sub astris. 613 aduer-
so 614 i qua mosaque t. coeti 615
Langerique 616 Andromedeque
uestigia 617 dandis († claudis) 619
transit et
ceruicem pectus (sic) ursae 620, 621 are
written in the right margin 622 que om.
fragrantem 623 canum 625 dilimite
tangit 627 liram currensque spiras
(que out of place) 628 preterit 629
Transuersaque cerat († cetat) 630 inde
631 Atque hoc aeterna fixerunt 632
per enni 634 precidit olimphum 635
diemque sextam exhuminat 637 Hic
mutat p. s. uices seu si quis edos (o
over d written later) 638 Seu parit
640 culminat mundum 641 medium

¹ This v. is, so far as I have examined, peculiar to M. It seems to mean Tangit et Aurigenam (Perseus) chelaram et summa recidit (or relidit).

(om. est) 641 repeated 642 et om.
643 abundus 644 quos tamen premit
646 p. ac summam numeramus utroque
(so the scribe; a later marginal corrector
has inserted sextam before numeramus, and

written a over utroque) 647 Et gelidum
extremum abigni 648 suos for
si uis 649 multum per orbem 650
Quidque erit terraque 653 aduer-
sum limite 655 r^hpēte (sic) 656 mota
657 quecūque tulerunt 658 in horas
661 tegit et refert 664 pleno producit
lumite giras 665 Atque a fine tytu-
lum orison 666 adite trahentis 669
om. 672 Hunc 675 Sic per terris giros
676 denexo 680 caelato 683 cursū
684 Alter in aduersum positos succedit ad
artos 685 aboree 686 Transq̄ inuer-
sae per sydera Cassioe pie 687 oblicum
689 equantigirū (so the m. pr.: later
i has been erased and ē written over

it, equant^h) 690 equis 691 sagit-
tari m. pr.: a later hand has added
an i 692 sumat 694 argunēque
m. pr., but the worm-hole makes it un-
certain: a later hand has written uu over
unē (?inē) amplustria 696 nude 697
Casi^hque pia super ipsum perseae tangit,
om. petens 698 as Jac. 699 Trisque
secant 705 uiridis 706 tactū 707
Inter diuisis equalibus est uia partis 709
nudis 710 nouit 711 lucet sic limes
olimpo 712 findens 713 nubilat c.
hiris 716 tactam 717 as Jac. 718 de-
ductis 719 Seminibus compagine rime
altered by a later hand to compage carine
721 Quid quasi 722 Conspicantque
723 mundus 726 Fusuram altered by a
later hand to Fixuram 727 nersus 728
altique cogat 729 secula 730 Illa: (e I
think perhaps later) diuersibus (sic) 732
as Jac. 733 Ceruleo uerso speciem mutas-
tasque colore² changed later to mutasse colorē
735 ab imis († unis) 738 cursuque 739

Li uxuriat mundo cupit et maiora patēte
740 orbemque regentem 741 Inp. polo
then 743 Errantis natu fl. cursumque s.
then 742 Defl. s. cursu riuisque q. So quite
plainly the scribe: a later corrector has
scratched through riuis and substituted
curuis) 744 Quid querimur sciuisse
with eui written by a different hand above
745 orbes 747 ut ipse: over ut is luit,
ipse corr. to ipsa by a later hand 748 Et

² Seems to point to caeruleo uersa speciem mutasse colore.

noua 750 referencia 751 e om. li-
quorem 752 dñm (dominum) marg. diuim
celumque colore 753 suos (sic)
755 as Jac. 756 contextit flammās et c.
l. candor (* later over or) 757 collato
758 nomine caelo 759 terreque remissa
760 Huc migrante orbe suum habitancia
caelum (so the *m. pr.*: afterwards changed
to Hoc mirant ex o.) 761 Aether-
eos feruntur (marg. fruuntur, in a
different hand and ink) 762 aecidas
763 Tididenque ferunt (changed later to
ferū) 764 uictore mithacum 766
Castra ducum et caeli metamque altered to
uictamque subsequently. The *m* of metam-
que is a little doubtful 767 iugitu
parti: so (seemingly) the scribe; a corrector
has erased iugitū and written nigrum in
the left margin, changing parti to partū.
769 Preream *m. pr.*, added later
reges alios 770 pella changed later
to bella 771 stricta spondere mentis
772 habuie (so, I think, the *m. pr.*: after-
wards changed to habuere) 773 solo fort-
isque ligurgus 774 Aethereos plato
corr. to Aethereusque nec qui 775
Dampnatusque dampnauit 776 P. et
metor straraton classibus (altered later
to strauit qui) 779 Romanique uir
liquorum (altered to uiri quorum later)
778 Ter quinoque et horatiū plures
(altered later to Terquinoque and pubes
uel proles 779 partus scellola
(u seems coeval) 780 est et colia uirgo
781 quae't'x moenia 782 cum milicio
cor intus adētus 783 in om. 784
cauillis altered later to camillus. 786
phirri papireus (* later) 787 turinsque
patens et terra palma 788 Marcellus-
que cossu prior de rege natato (? natoito)
789 Decii 790 flammis (for fabius)
792 Scipindeque (?) imum 793
pētrisque (* possibly later) 794 Ante
deum 795 caelum et claudia 796 da-
rit marelli 797 sub aruis 798 agrippe
799 celumque 801 dñm (altered above to
diuum) 802 candit 804 similis. After
this 809-812. Then DE COMETIS. Then
805 initial A om. 806 carmina 807
Impl. 808 Quidquam uigeat quandoque
809 Sunt alio aduersa 812 uenerem in-
tangit 813, 4 Sunt et iam rarisorti subitas

candescere lāmas (sic) 815 tractosque
816 Raro per ingentis u. sacula m. 817
ingentum 818 Humidior 819 dispulsa
821 Aera (? Rera) for Apta dimissus
corripit 822 depraendit flama capacem
824 similma fimo 825 as Jac. 826
Subsistant fulgentque cometa 827
ortis 828 praua accessis 829
diestz esset celumque reditz (reditque)
830 Immensum depreh. 831 Tunc
832 Arridior cōpreh. 835 Sen longi
836 tenuisque capillos 838 facies
839 imaginæ 840 conpagine ductus
841 teretemne 842 timidis exequat
843 procero distenta uteros partasque
capellas 844 paruos signis glomeratur
845 Hirta figurantis tremido sub limine
menses 846 Lampada et 847 as Jac.
848 per mundum mundum 850
Exuruntque uiam 851 tenuantur 852
euncti permixti 853 nubes 854 Ae-
thnamque minantur 855 ipsas 857
collisa crematur 859 subita se rumpere
860 choruscis 861 complexum spirantis
864 et mediis 865 preuentis semine
866 In uolucres ignis posuit 867
obcuncta 868 tenues 869 stestu
m. pr. 870 flāmantis 874 miseratur
875 adfectus 875 Nunquam futilibus
excanduit ignis aether 879 merentis
inuentos 880 rabe 881 exustis laet.
f. medullis 882 Labentisque orbes
883 fata 884 erectecos 887 medice
(clearly) 888 et funera deerant 890
menbris 891 uia 892 comete 894
Ardentis 895 natura omnium sortita
901 imitancia 904 Ne mirereque graues
rerum 906 Ciuilis et nam 911
laserosque ari 912 cū fluxit
913 Per quod patris pater 914 acua
916 Alia 917 rependit 918 sisto
920 imitatur 921 coepit 923 mutra
for uincta 924 Aeterno 925 mincius
(?) for inuictus 926 non querit.

M. MANILI ASTRONOMI CON LIBER PRIMVS EX-
PLICIT INCIPIT SECVNDVΣ

(the last letter of SECVNDVΣ is a Greek Σ.
Then

Quae signa masculina sunt et quae feminina
to

De duodecim cathemoriis.

(To be continued.)

PLATO, *REPUBLIC* 422 E.

Μαζόνως, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, χρή προσαγορεύειν τὰς ἄλλας· ἐκάστη γὰρ αὐτῶν πόλεις εἰσὶ πάμπολλαι, ἀλλ' οὐ πόλις, τὸ τῶν παιζόντων. Reference to the game πόλιν παίζειν has been generally assumed by the interpreters ancient and modern; but the President of Magdalen remarks that 'it is possible that the old interpreters were misled by the word παιζόντων and the well-known game, and that a merely general expression is intended, "Cities, not

a city, as they say in jest," "ut more loquar iocantium—Ficinus."

Perhaps the reference is to the joke—about people who break things 'making the One Many'—alluded to in *Meno* 77 A παῦσαι πολλὰ ποιῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐνός, ὅπερ φασὶ τοὺς συντρίβοντάς τι ἐκάστοτε οἱ σκώπτοντες, ἀλλ' ἐάσας ὅλην καὶ ὑγιᾶ εἰπέ, τί ἐστὶν ἀρετή.

J. A. STEWART.

NASIDIENUS (HORACE, *SAT.* ii. 8).

THIS name, which has often been regarded as an invention of Horace's own, has lately been proved to be real by the discovery of a Rhenish inscription. The inscription, which was said to have been in existence some century and a half ago, walled up in the Zeughaus at Cologne, had been regarded by Brambach and others as a forgery. In reality, it had gone to Paris, where it was lately noticed in the Cabinet des Médailles and its genuineness at once recognized. Now an adequate account of it has been published by Prof. Zangemeister in the *Westdeutsche Zeitschrift* (xi. 267—272). The inscription reads *L. Nasidienus Agripp. tribun(us) leg(ionis) xiv. gem(inae)*. In date it is certainly earlier than A.D. 61 and prob-

ably a good deal earlier. Nasidienus is, I imagine, a *nomen* of the same form as Alfenus, Anniolenus, Salvidenus, Vetulenus, Vettienus, Arulenus and many more. *Agripp.* is either abbreviated for *Agrippinensis*, i.e. native of Cologne (in which case the stone was erected after A.D. 51), or far more probably, as Prof. Zangemeister observes, a cognomen, *Agripp(a)*. The fourteenth legion, in which our Nasidienus commanded, was never, so far as we know, stationed in lower Germany, but the tombstone of a higher officer might easily have no connection with the station of his legion.

F. HAVERFIELD.

VAN LEEUWEN'S *ENCHIRIDIUM*.

Enchiridium Dictionis Epicae. Scripsit J. van LEEUWEN J. F. Pars Prior. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W. Sijthoff. 1892. 3 fl. 60.

THE indefatigable scholar whose last work now lies before us is evidently determined not to let the grass grow under his feet. Hardly was his edition of the *Odyssey* published before he had followed it up by the present instalment of what will be a Homeric Grammar of considerable bulk. He regrets that here the companionship of his Euryalus fails him—'defecit opera fidi sodalis mei atque amici Mendes da Costa'—and compassionates the reader for the loss. Let him cheer up; the book shows no marks of suffering from the dissolution of partnership.

It is impossible for an English critic to

avoid comparing this work with the monumental work of Mr. Monro. No two books on the same subject could well be in more striking contrast; in arrangement, method and style they are wide as the poles asunder, while treating of the same material. The Provost of Oriel remains prudently entrenched behind his bulwarks, his feet are on the unshaken rock of the Alexandrine text, and save for his well-known observation on λούσθαι he preserves a serene gravity. Dr. van Leeuwen is ever making excursions and sallies, wherein at one time he cuts off a fair herd of kine, at another returns augmented indeed but not with spoil. For the Alexandrine text he cares no more than Pandarus, according to Chaucer, cared for his 'old hat.' And when he gets a chance he makes as merry as the somewhat unpromising environment per-

mits. His history of the discovery and conquest of the digamma is as lively and interesting as a chapter of Prescott's *Mexico*. In short, throughout the Dutch scholar aims at brilliancy, the English at solidity.

There are certain points on which van Leeuwen might learn wisdom from Monro. The book before us, like his Homeric text, affords instances of enclitics in a position where Homeric usage does not permit them to stand; e.g. in Y 186 he conjectures χαλεπῶς ῥέζειν σε Φέσολπα. Again in prefixing the digamma to ὄλμος and speaking of ἀφολλέες he forgets that this letter is not found before a simple *o*, as a rule. But in the question of *φόψ* (= *vox*) I agree with him against Mr. Monro; the evidence for *φόψ* is pretty strong and the tendency to distinguish *ὄψ* (*facies*) from *φόψ* (*vox*) might keep the digamma in this word in spite of the general rule, much as in Spanish *fijo* (*filius*) has become *hijo*, while *fijo* (*fixus*) has retained the *f*.¹

¹ The case is not of course quite the same, as the *f* is not lost before *i* regularly in Spanish. But the parallel of this loss of *f* is so interesting that I am tempted to call attention to it here. In the Epic of the *Cid* and other old works the *f* is constant, it is lost in later Spanish in many words, replaced by an *h* which is not sounded. In some words *f* or *h* is 'used promiscuously to this day, as *fanega* or *haneaga*,' which shows how vain it is to assert that this could not be the case with the digamma in the Homeric age.

On the regulations of the weak caesura in the fourth foot Dr. van Leeuwen has a theory of his own and complains that Mr. Monro has not accepted it in his second edition. I must confess to being equally obdurate; I cannot see that Dr. van Leeuwen has proved his point.

The arrangement is as follows. He divides the book so far into three principal divisions. The first deals with metre. The second has two chapters, the first on the vowels and diphthongs, which includes a long and interesting polemic against Fick, the second on the consonants, of which the most interesting part is that concerning the digamma. The reading of one of the British Museum papyri in B 316, *τηνδελξαμενος*, is invoked as evidence for ancient tradition: is it not simply a case of lipography? The third division is *de Flexione Nominum*, containing general observations, the three declensions, comparison, numerals, and pronouns. The whole shows great learning and the command of a vast mass of materials, and if the conclusions must sometimes be taken with caution, it must still prove of much value. A long course yet remains, as will be easily seen, before the author, which we hope he may successfully and rapidly traverse.

ARTHUR PLATT.

WECKLEIN'S *PROMETHEUS*.

Aeschylus Prometheus, für den Schulgebrauch erklärt, von N. WECKLEIN. Leipzig, Teubner, 1893. 1 Mk. 80.

THIS third edition of Wecklein's edition of the *Prometheus Vinculus* will be eagerly welcomed by students of Greek tragedy. It contains in the text and critical notes many alterations of the views expressed in previous editions, while the commentary may almost be said to have been re-written. It is superfluous to call attention to Dr. Wecklein's intimate acquaintance with the criticism of Greek tragedy, or to the open-mindedness of his elaborate and helpful discussion of all doubtful and difficult points. I propose here to mention only some points in the commentary and the critical notes which seem to me specially noteworthy or still open to doubt. In the former it may be observed: that at v. 62, notwithstanding the length of the

note, there is no clear indication of the author's view of the construction, i.e. whether in the full expression *ὦν* would be needed twice, or whether Prometheus is said to be a *νοθέστερος σοφιστής* than Zeus; again, that at 204 Wecklein still takes *βουλεύω*, with *πιθεῖν* directly depending on it, in the sense, I suppose, of *resolving*, or *meaning*. Against this it may be urged: (1) that, though Thucydides uses the aorist *βουλεύσθαι* in the sense of *come to a resolution*, *βουλεύειν* means either absolutely *to deliberate* (like *βουλεύεσθαι*) or (more often in tragedy) *to advise*; (2) that we do not thus get the requisite contrast between the participle and the main verb—there is not so proper a contrast between *though I meant* and *I could not as between though I advised* and *I could not persuade*; (3) that the *αἰνῶναι μηχαναί* naturally refer back to some *advice* given, but not so well to a *resolve*. 209. Wecklein agrees with those who

identify Gaia and Themis. 239. He takes the *προ-* in *προθέμενος* as *temporal*. 345. Wecklein still maintains that *οὐνεκα* is not an admissible form for the preposition, though referring to Meisterhans 177².

The text shows close upon fifty alterations from that of the previous edition, nor does it by any means always agree with that of the author's critical edition of Aeschylus published in 1885. Some of these variations are doubtless due to the fact that the editor of a school edition allows himself greater freedom in the adoption of bold emendations which improve the sense and remove difficulties than could the editor of a critical text. Of this kind is the adoption at v. 494 f. of Wieseler's *ἔχουσ'....χολή* for *ἔχουτ'....χολῆς* (in this passage Wecklein now takes all the accusatives as governed by *διώρισα* in v. 489), and of Pauw's *σάγμασιν* at v. 463. At the same time it is interesting to notice that out of seven passages in which Wecklein returns to the reading of the MS. there are two (*ἄβατον* in v. 2, and *πόρον* in v. 59) in which he had not so returned in 1885.

One or two special points in the editor's present constitution of the text may now be noted. At 378 Wecklein now reads *ψυχῆς νοούσης*. Why should we not keep the MS. *ὀργῆς* in the sense which the word bears at v. 80? The quotations given in the critical notes show that the verse was very familiar in antiquity; and the authors who quoted it seem purposely to have varied the words. Of vv. 425—430 Wecklein gives in three editions four different versions. In his last he has come round to Hermann's view that it is the strophe to which vv. 431—435 form the antistrophe. 473—475. Wecklein admits no alteration of the

MS. reading: *κακός*, he says (in the commentary), does not mean *inefficient*, but I do not understand what he says it does mean. Is it possible that it means *fainthearted*? Wecklein truly says that the omission of the *σὺ* with *ἰάσιμος*, the addition of which would bring the sentence into a line with v. 42 is made up for by the *σεαντόν*. 667. The construction is greatly simplified by the adoption of Naber's *εἰ* for *κεἶ*. 680. Wecklein adopts Headlam's *ἄπτερος* for *ἀφνίδιος*.

At 762 and 921 Wecklein reads *πρὸς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ* and *ἐπ' αὐτὸς αὐτῷ* respectively, though the MS. and all other editors, I believe, give the rough breathing in the oblique cases. We need a fuller statement of the editor's reasons for the change, and of the precise doctrine which he holds in the matter. For instance, why in the note on 762 does he write *αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτοῦ*? In the passages from Sophocles quoted in his note L¹ (often corrected) clearly gives the smooth breathing. In some of the instances the case is further complicated by the fact that the *αὐτοῦ* does not stand for *ἐαυτοῦ* but for *ἐμυτοῦ* (as at *El.* 285, and *O.T.* 138) or *σεαντοῦ* (as at *O.C.* 929). Apparently Wecklein would only admit the smooth breathing in the oblique case when it immediately follows the *αὐτός*, and regards the juxtaposition as like that of *ἄκουσαν ἄκων* at v. 671. The question suggests itself, will any one maintain that the oblique cases of *αὐτός* could ever be used reflexively when they do not come after the nom. of the same word?—ought we, e.g., sometimes, with good MSS. to write *αὐτῶν* and not *αὐτῶν* where it stands for *ἑμῶν αὐτῶν*? No one surely will on the other hand maintain that we ought to write *αὐτοκτόνος*.

E. B. ENGLAND.

VERRALL'S *CHOEPHORI*.

The 'Choephorì' of Aeschylus, with an Introduction, Commentary, and Translation by A. W. VERRALL, Litt. D., etc. Macmillan & Co. 1893. 12s.

The general plan of this volume is already familiar from the earlier volumes of the same edition—the *Seven against Thebes*, 1887, and the *Agamemnon*, 1889. The Introduction covers sixty-two pages, of which more than half is given to an elaborate essay on the Recognition, and about twenty pages to the Story of Orestes; four pages are devoted

to the Use of the Scholia—intended in general to diminish confidence in the statements of the old Greek commentators—and five to the divisions of the play, the scenes and performers. The text and commentary occupy 154 pages. Fifty pages are devoted to the detailed discussion of thirty-five difficult and disputed passages, in most of which the editor presents original views. A second appendix of half a dozen pages restates the editor's position on the correspondence of strophe and antistrophe, presenting a less offensive view of his thesis

than was offered in his edition of the *Septem*, where he 'admitted no alteration of the MS. however slight, which depends for its justification on metrical considerations only.' Now we read, 'The only assertion which I have made or make is the negative assertion, that the theory of *syllabic* correspondence between strophe and antistrophe has not been proved, for Aeschylus, and conflicts with a large mass of *prima facie* evidence.' The translation covers twenty-three pages, and the indexes occupy five.

The work displays Mr. Verrall's characteristic qualities. It is learned, sometimes brilliant; it is, above all, ingenious. The editor says so many bright things that he can hardly expect to be approved in all, or even to be entirely consistent with himself. A commonplace reader is sometimes in doubt when the comment is to be taken as a serious suggestion, and when it is a mere *Einfall*, not yet carefully weighed, but thrown out for what it may be worth. We are thankful that the editor had not the desire to *re-write* his author, that we are past the days of Burges. The other extreme of adhering to the MSS. and conjecturing merely new constructions and explanations, is less dangerous, because the reader is less easily misled. But of the new interpretations which our editor proposes, few compel immediate approval, and many seem to hang in the air.

A characteristic example of the editor's indulgence of his imagination is found in his treatment of vs. 692 ff., given by Kirchhoff from the MS. (with *κομίζων* for *νομίζων*) as follows:

καὶ νῦν Ὀρέστης ἦν γὰρ εὐβούλως ἔχων,
ἔξω κομίζων ὀλεθρίου πηλοῦ πόδα.
νῦν δὴ περ ἐν δόμοισι βακχείας καλῆς
ιατρὸς ἐλπίς ἦν παρούσαν ἐγγράφει.

Paley makes no essential change, except that of δ' ἦπερ for δὴ περ, placing a comma before ἦπερ, and another before παρούσαν. Weil writes the two last verses thus:

νῦν δ', ἦπερ ἐν δόμοισι βακχείας ἄλης
ιατρὸς ἐλπίς παραπέσουσαν ἐγγράφει.

Weeklein follows the hint of a scholium and writes:

νῦν δ', ἦπερ ἐν δόμοισι βακχείας καλῆς
ιατρὸς ἐλπίς ἦν, ἀπούσαν ἐγγράφει.

Our editor writes as follows:

καὶ νῦν Ὀρέστης σ'—ἦν γὰρ εὐβούλως ἔχων,
ἔξω κομίζων ὀλεθρίου πηλοῦ πόδα—
νῦν δ', ἦπερ ἐν δόμοισι βακχείας καλῆς
ιατρὸς ἐλπίς ἦν, παρούσαν ἐγγράφει,

and translates: 'And now Orestes—who had with prudence kept clear of the fatal avalanche—Orestes now records the present even in that very chamber, where with returning strength he was projecting a triumphant carouse.' Among the added comments is this: 'Orestes in his Phocian refuge, as Clytaemnestra is pleased to consider it, could console himself for his losses with the thought that at any rate he had escaped the fatality of his family (cf. *Ag.* 1567—1576). He is compared therefore to a dweller in the mountains, who, after incurring much peril from torrent and avalanche, has escaped, not without injury, to his cabin. Exulting in his deliverance, and fancying himself secure, he is about to repair his strength, and honour the occasion, with meat and wine, when the flood, rising higher or breaking out in a fresh place, rushes into the cabin itself.' In the Appendix the scene is disclosed still further and for the explanation of *παρούσαν* the following is suggested (not urged): 'I believe that [Aeschylus] had in view a recent and tragical incident, and that *παρούσαν ἐγγράφει* is part of the story. Some herdsman of the hills, cut off, as frequently happens, by an outbreak of the waters, had taken refuge in his cabin, and had been found there, drowned by the torrent, which rose and filled his refuge. The feet of the man showed that he had escaped the first time with difficulty; the wine-bottle, from which he was about to drink, lay by his side; and scrawled upon the wall was the beginning of a message, one word more eloquent than many—Πάρεστι, *It is here!* The facts told the story, and Aeschylus has etched it in verse.' This whole romance rests on the editor's interpretation of *πηλός* as an *avalanche* instead of *mud*. 'Nothing could be less apt than to compare an inevitable pursuing Fate to any *πηλός* which we are accustomed to think of. The *πηλός* which Aeschylus pictures, is a spreading, sliding mass of earth and water, stones and gravel, tons in weight and yards in breadth, which covers half a hill-side, and swallows up trees and cottages.' Of course this is all unbridled imagination; *πηλός* is simply *clay*, and we have an exact parallel to the Greek proverb in the Psalmist's 'out of an horrible pit, out of the *miry clay*' (*ἀπὸ πηλοῦ ἱλίου*).

Another original interpretation is given for 882, *τοῖκε νῦν αὖ τῆς* (so for *αὐτῆς*) *ἐπὶ ξυροῦ πέλας αὐχὴν πεσιῶσθαι* κ.τ.λ., where *τῆς ἐπὶ ξυροῦ* is declared to mean *the female barber*. In 574, *ποδῶκει περιβαλὼν χαλκεύματι*, the editor refuses to accept *ποδῶκει* as equivalent to *ταχεῖ*, but '*swift as the sound of the syllable ποδ*'. The modern reader will doubtless think this detestable: so would Euripides, and so would Sophocles. Other men, as great as these or greater, have thought otherwise.'

A discussion of the novelties of this edition would occupy much space. A few details may be added. The gist of the discussion of the *Recognition* is that the descendants of Pelops could be distinguished from the ordinary Greek by the shape of the foot and by the quality of the hair, just as a lock of an African's woolly hair and the print of his flat foot can be distinguished from the European's straight hair and the print of his foot with high instep. 'In comparison with the Achaeans around them Orestes and Electra were octoroons.' The tragedy is divided into three acts: 'the first act takes place in the early morning; the second at nightfall; and the third on the next day.' The first act takes place at the grave of Agamemnon; the rest of the play at the castle. A secondary chorus is assumed, who 'sing the *entr'acte* between Acts I. and II., and are afterwards absorbed into the train of Orestes.' The editor does not approve of the conjectural repetition of the *epithymia* after 795 etc. He perhaps fails to appreciate the simplicity of life in the heroic age when he thinks that Orestes, expecting 'to be received into a royal castle on terms which will bring him into personal intercourse with the lord and lady,' must have come as 'a substantial merchant conveying a rich caravan,' rather than as 'a

pedlar who carries his own pack'; and in his criticism of the old nurse as *aide de camp*. In his comment on the Homeric reference to Clytaemnestra's death, he pays no regard to Robert's attractive conjecture that, according to the epic poet's form of the story, the false queen was not killed by her son but hung herself. *Κλυταιμνήστρα* is read in the text, according to the best authorities, but *Clytaemnestra* is retained as the English form of the name; and this will probably continue to be English usage. *Clytaemnestra*, *Iason* and *Iocasta* are not likely to make their way in English literature. No metrical schemes are given for the lyric passages, although most users of the book would find such schemes convenient at times and for certain purposes, if not for the elementary purpose of fixing the ietus-syllables.

The form of the work compels comparison with Professor Jebb's *Sophocles*, and the reviewer is obliged to consider the edition of Sophocles far superior in literary spirit. Mr. Verrall adduces far fewer parallel passages for the illustration of poetic expressions, and his interest seems to lie in a colder kind of interpretation. The ordinary student certainly will read the commentary to the *Choephoroi* with little zest. But we must remember that in many passages of our play the text is in a desperate condition, and that no two scholars can be expected to agree in all the details of the interpretation of some of these odes. The effort to make the Greek intelligible is laudable. But in spite of all the editor's learning and ingenuity, a student who should begin his careful study of Aeschylus in the use of this book, and should trust in its methods, would be philologically lost.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

WELLDON'S NICOMACHEAN ETHICS.

THIS is a very serviceable translation, in which the student will find his difficulties, if not always removed, at least fully recognized and directly met. Mr. Welldon's method is to be very literal in difficult passages, with the result that, although the English is sometimes pretty hard—sometimes nearly as hard as the Greek—no doubt is left in the reader's mind as to what a very competent scholar takes the grammatical construction to be. This—and it is no small matter—is

the special merit, it seems to me, of Mr. Welldon's translation. On the other hand, what may be called the philosophical ring of Aristotle's thought is better caught, I think, by Mr. Peters, with whose scholarly translation Mr. Welldon's translation may be naturally compared. A narrow comparison however between two translations, each so good in its different way, in order to show that in this or that respect one is superior to the other, would not be instructive, and

might be unfair; so, I will merely say that, while Mr. Peters appears to advantage in passages of great philosophical importance—passages in which the subtlety and manifold ramifications of the Aristotelian technique have to be carefully taken into account—Mr. Welldon is at his best in passages of less technical and more general and descriptive character—as in passages which might be pointed out in the fourth, eighth, and ninth books, and elsewhere, *e.g.* in v. 8, 1135 b 11—1136 a 5 (pp. 163—4 Welldon).

A few separate points on which I venture, with all respect, to differ from Mr. Welldon may be mentioned in conclusion:—

P. 174, v. 11, 1138 a 14. 'Again, in the sense in which a man is said to be unjust, if he merely commits injustice and is not entirely vicious [*i.e.* when his action, but not his moral purpose, is unjust: *footnote*] it is impossible for him to act unjustly to himself.' The distinction, I take it, here is between the *ἀνίστος* and the *παράνομος*.

P. 212, vii. 3, 1147 a 5. 'Thus, *the major premiss may be*, "Dry things are good for every man," and *the minor premiss* "So and so is a man," or "Such a thing is dry."' I understand *ξηρὸν τὸ τοιῶνδε* to be, not a minor, but a major premiss.

P. 216, vii. 4, 1148 a 2. 'While incon-

tinence is censured not as a mistake only, but as a vice, whether a vice of an absolute or of some particular kind....' I think that ἡ ἀπλῶς οὕσα ἡ κατὰ τι μέρος goes with ἡ ἀκρασία (a 2), not with κακία τις (a 3).

P. 217, vii. 4, 1148 a 17. 'Hence we should call a person more licentious, if without desire....' Here Mr. Welldon, together with some other scholars, seems to me to go wrong in taking the words μάλλον ἀκόλαστον = ἀκολαστότερον. The writer is distinguishing between the ἀκόλαστος and the ἀκρατής, and says, as I understand him, that the term ἀκόλαστος is applied to the man who pursues excessive pleasures without desire *rather than* to the man who does so from a violent desire—the latter is ἀκρατής.

P. 267, viii. 10, 1160 b 7. 'Tyranny is the opposite of kingship, as it pursues the good of the tyrant himself. *It is clear that kingship is the best form of polity*: but it is still clearer that tyranny is the worst. The opposite of the best is always worst.' The comparison in φανερώτερον is not, I think, between τυραννίς and βασιλεία, but between τυραννίς, the worst of the παρεμβάσεις, and τιμοκρατία, the worst of the ὀρθαὶ πολιτεῖαι.

J. A. STEWART.

THE SATIRES OF PERSIUS BY CONINGTON AND NETTLESHIP.

The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus, with a translation and commentary by JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. Third edition, edited by Prof. H. NETTLESHIP.

THE duty of preparing a notice of this work has been changed from a pleasure into an occasion of sorrow by the death of Professor Nettleship, which occurred while I was reading the volume. This is hardly the place to dwell on those personal qualities which will cause his memory to be warmly cherished by all who knew him. But I cannot pass by the opportunity for expressing my very strong feeling of the loss which Latin scholarship has sustained by his premature removal. In the last of many delightful conversations which I had with him, he spoke to me at length about the tasks in which he was already engaged, and about others which he hoped to accomplish. Much as he has done, the best and ripest results of his labours were still to be gathered in.

The changes which this third edition exhibits are more considerable than those which were introduced into the second. A good *apparatus criticus*, which was much needed, has been supplied, along with a description of the evidence on which the text must rest. But the passages in which readings have been altered are very few; and in these cases the reasons are strong, as in III. 100 (*trientem* for *triental*) and III. 12 (*querimur* for *queritur*). Prof. Nettleship has treated Conington's work with true *pietas*; he has extended it and enriched it everywhere, but has reconstructed it as little as possible. The references and illustrations now added to the notes for the first time are numerous and valuable. Many bear evidence to much study of inscriptions, glosses, and other remote sources of information. The longer notes which have been inserted are for the most part of a lexicographical character. Many notes of this class which had been introduced into the second edition are now extended.

There are but few new interpretations of difficult passages. One of these is V. 61, et sibi iam seri vitam ingemuere relictam: 'that their true life has been left behind in the race for enjoyment.' This explanation (fortified by a quotation from Seneca) is unquestionably correct. To the laborious minutiae of revision Prof. Nettleship has attended with admirable patience and care. Among other things, the mode of reference to many authors quoted in the notes has been changed and improved. An examination of the index discloses verification and adaptation to changes in the body of the volume. Mint and rue have been tithed, but the weightier matters of the law have not been neglected.

The introductory essay by Conington has been left untouched, but for the addition of a few footnotes. It is graceful and suggestive, like all Conington's work, but imperfect, considered as an introduction to an edition of Persius. Had Prof. Nettleship felt himself free to reconstruct, he would doubtless have modified it greatly. On a subject which especially interests me, the debt of Persius to Lucilius, the essay gives a somewhat uncertain sound, at one time seeming to rate it highly, at another to make little of it, and to overestimate the influence of Horace. A study of the Lucilian fragments side by side with the text of Persius must, I think, lead to the conclusion that much which Persius has been supposed to owe to Horace, was taken direct from the older satirist. This is particularly the case with the ethical and philosophical passages. In style, Persius certainly made his way back to Lucilius. Conington strangely speaks (p. xxiv.) of 'the ambition with which the pupil was constantly striving to improve upon his master's (Horace's) felicity of expression.' I will conclude by giving a few notes on passages in Persius which have a bearing on Lucilius.

I. 1, 2. It is not observed in the notes on these lines that some of the MSS. of the scholia indicate the first line as having been borrowed from Lucilius, others the second. The probability is that the scholion refers to the first line, but that the name of Lucilius has been substituted for that of Lucretius. As is well known, the same confusion exists elsewhere.

I. 20, ingentis trepidare Titos. The context shows that these 'Titi' are 'de gente hircosa centurionum' (III. 77), like 'Pulfennius ingens,' who is one of the 'varicosi centuriones' (v. 189). But why

should Persius pick out the name Titus as a typical name for a centurion? Cicero, *Fin.* I. § 8 preserves a Lucilian line, which Baehrens writes thus: municipem Ponti Titi et Anni, centurionum, where the MSS. give *tiranii, tritanii, tritunii*, etc. T. Pontius is known as a famous centurion; if there was also a T. Annus equally known to fame and of the same town, Persius, getting his cue from Lucilius, might well refer to the two as 'the mighty Titi.' The line of Persius seems to confirm the conjecture of Baehrens.

I. 26, pallor seniumque: cf. Lucil. 363 and 794 (ed. Baehr.).

I. 62, *posticus*, used of a person, occurs in Lucil. 84.

I. 122, hoc ridere meum, tam nil, nulla tibi vendo Iliade. In *Cena Trimalchionis* § 52 (ed. Friedlander), the host says 'meum intellegere nulla pecunia vendo.' Both passages are most likely imitated from Lucilius. Between the work of Persius and that of Petronius there seems to be no direct contact.

III. 78, non ego curo esse quod Arcesilas aerumnosique Solones. The ignorant man into whose mouth these words are put takes Arcesilas and Solon as types of the speculative and thoughtful men whom he loathes. The selection is curious, but the name of Arcesilas at least was probably suggested here to Persius by Lucilius. Nonius, s.v. *excidere*, quotes a line of Lucilius (Baehr. 529): metuo ut fieri possit, ergo vivo, ab Arciloco excido. Nonius explains *excido* as equivalent to *dissentio*. The only *Arcilocus* to whom Lucilius is at all likely to have referred is the satirist; but any reference to him is here out of place. The ordinary assumption, that a line of Archilocus: χρημάτων ἀελπτον οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδ' ἀπόμωστον is here alluded to, is farfetched and improbable. The name *Arcesila* should be substituted for *Arciloco*. The sense is: 'I go in for enjoyment of life and give up laborious thinking'; in other words: 'I cease to be an Academic and join the Epicurean school.' *Excido* is rather ἐκπίπτω than *dissentio*: 'I am cast out by A.' In the twenty-seventh book of the satires of Lucilius, to which the passage belongs, there are a good many allusions to philosophy. The two fragments which immediately precede this in the edition of Baehrens (527 and 528) probably bore on the same theme. Fragments 429, 430, 573, 581 (Baehr.) all in like manner relate to a change of philosophic opinions. The word *cedere*, which is applied to such a change in 573, is employed exactly in the same way

by Cicero *Acad.* II. 63. I may note that in 581 the reading of Baehrens, *persta nec* for *persuade et* of MSS., is nearer the mark than L. Mueller's *pervade*. It is quite possible that Ribbeck may be right in proposing *Arcesilas* for the corrupt *narcesibai* in 362: in numero quorum nunc primus Trebellius multos Lucius narcesibai senium vomitum pus. The words may have been put into the mouth of a muscular centurion, who objected to Trebellius as a vile product of the philosophical schools.

VI. 79, iam deciens redit in rugam. No real parallel has been produced for the use of *ruga* as 'a purse.' Why it should ever have been supposed (see Conington) that Juvenal XIV. 325, *rugam trahit*, is an imitation of this passage, is hard to understand. *Rugam* seems to me to be an error of the MSS. for *bulgam*, which means 'purse' in Lucil. 185 and in a fragment of Varro's Menippean Satires. In these Satires Varro of course frequently imitated Lucilius.

J. S. REID.

MOELLER'S HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

History of the Christian Church, A.D. 1—600, by the late Dr. WILHELM MOELLER, Professor Ordinarius of Church History in the University of Kiel. Translated from the German by ANDREW RUTHERFORD, B.D. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 1892. 15s.

THIS is a Church History of the first rank, and in some ways perhaps the best we have. Whoso wants a repertory of the facts of Church History accurately given, well brought up to date, and provided with ample references to the recent literature of the subject, he will be thoroughly satisfied with Dr. Moeller's labours.

These merits are of the highest; but the drawbacks are serious. The arrangement

is a strange one, which turns back from Dioeletian to Irenaeus, and from Benedict of Nursia to Arianism. Style there is none, even in the original; and in the translation things are not at all improved. Facts are crowded together without much indication of their relative importance beyond occasional Clarendon type. Above all, the view taken is entirely an outside one, and singularly lifeless. Dr. Moeller is much more interested, for example, in giving a catalogue of Tertullian's works than in clearly stating his relation to heathenism or Montanism. As a book of reference, the work is admirable; but even the original can only be read continuously by those who have the digestion of an ostrich.

H. M. GWATKIN.

Platon, Phédon, par PAUL COUVREUR. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 16mo. pp. li. 144.

THIS is a school edition of the *Phaedo* with introduction and brief explanatory notes. In the introduction, after a short account of Plato's life, the editor proceeds to deal with the *Phaedo* first as a philosophical treatise, next as a work of art. Writing for boys, he wisely refrains from entering upon the abstruser questions of Platonic philosophy, raised directly or indirectly by the dialogue; just as in his commentary he passes lightly over the metaphysical difficulties with which the later part of the dialogue abounds. At the same time this part of the introduction can hardly be considered quite satisfactory. M. Cuvreur is very sceptical about the possibility of a chronological arrangement of the dialogues; and yet he boldly affirms that the tenth book of the *Republic* is posterior to the *Phaedo*: the only reason assigned is that 'Socrate, exposant une preuve de l'immortalité de l'âme, paraît bien renvoyer à celles qu'il développe dans le Phédon.'

Other statements to which exception could be taken are less misleading for young readers. The latter part of this section is much better: the editor warns his scholars that they must distinguish between 'substantial immortality,' which alone can be deduced from Plato's reasoning, and 'personal immortality,' in which, as our editor holds, Plato believed, although he knew it to be undemonstrable. The section which follows, on the literary side of the *Phaedo*, is excellent. Next comes a very concise analysis of the dialogue. The introductory portion includes also a critical appendix and a note on orthography.

The notes are extremely concise and for the most part sound and scholarly: though a few instances may be found of obscurity or error. For instance what are we to make of the note on 59 E 'τελευτήσῃ: en style direct, τελευτήσεις. De là le subjonctif avec ἔν?' And just below is not the explanation of ἀνευφήμις as 'le contraire de εὐφημεῖν' likely to lead beginners to a confusion about the first member of the compound? Again, on 67 C, M. Cuvreur

should not have told his pupils that the genitive *οἱ* (personal pronoun) is not found in prose: there are at least four instances in Plato himself. In 77 D, *διακεδάνουσιν* is rightly retained, but wrongly explained. On 109 D, it is erroneously said that 'dans le Timée, la terre tourne.' A few more mistakes might be added to the list, which nevertheless would not be a long one. A fair instance of the editor's power of compressing his information into the smallest compass is the note on 85 C: 'Μὴ προ-αφίστασθαι dépend toujours de μὴ οὐχί, et les deux négations se détruisent. Μὴ οὐχί, qui ne s'emploie régulièrement qu'après une proposition négative, s'explique ici parce que μαλθακὸν = ἀνάνδρου = οὐκ ἀνδρῆλου.' Possibly, owing to this brevity, the notes, despite their clearness, will not always enable the learner to see his way through a sentence at a glance: but they are none the worse for that.

There are some new readings in the text (to say nothing of a few very old ones), of which the most important is *ἡκιστα* for *μάλιστα* in 68 C. In matters of interpretation there appears to be nothing particularly new.

In print, paper and binding this little book will compare favourably with many English school-books costing three or four times as much.

R. D. ARCHER-HIND.

Latin Prose Composition. By G. G. RAMSAY, M.A., LL.D. Vol. I. Third edition. 4s. 6d.

THE book consists of a series of notes on Syntax, with easy progressive exercises intended to illustrate them, and with help-notes, followed in Part II. by harder continuous passages for translation, with an Appendix of Hints for Elementary Prose and a Vocabulary and Index.

The combination of Grammar and Exercise-book has some advantages, but for practical use in writing Latin Prose a separate and continuous Syntax, easy for reference, should be at hand. The danger of help-notes at the foot of a passage is that boys eagerly look down and substitute the easier English below for the harder above, without connecting the two, or referring the change to any general law; and so they gain little help for similar difficulties elsewhere. Help-notes also like 'use the imperfect,' with no reason added, do little good. In these respects no doubt the book might be improved; but the notes are good and useful, and sometimes are sensibly put in the form of suggestive questions, e.g. 'What tense does the sense require?'

The Syntax in the way of general principles (e.g. Case-meanings) takes for the most part the line, and embodies the results, of recent studies (esp. English and American); but in details has a tendency to revert to old lines; e.g. 'The Supine in -um is an accusative of Motion Towards' (p. 48). 'Motion to a place (p. 52) is invariably expressed by the Accusative.' [Surely uses like *ob-* (*ad-*) *equitare*, *ob-* (*ad-*) *venio*, *il clamor* &c., &c., c. dat. deserve notice.] 'The Ablat. Absolute Construction, e.g. *Te veniente dic...* ...*canebat*, is independent of the rest of the sentence,' p. 92 [as if more independent than *nocte proxima* or *luce prima*]. '*Hoc facerem* I would do this,' p. 247 § 18(5). The following may be given as instances of more novel views, not to be adopted too hastily; '*Metuere ut* &c. (p. 181), lit. to have fears as to its happening'; '*tantum abest ut ornem...* lit. the fact that I adorn, &c.' (p. 149). On the whole the book may be recommended as likely to be of much practical use, especially for boys in the middle forms of public schools.

J. E. N.

De Duall Graecorum et emoriente et reviviscente. Hermannus Schmidt. (A reprint from the *Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen*.) 1893. pp. 54.

PREVIOUS investigators, especially G. Blackert, Bieber, Keck, and Meisterhans, had traced the gradual recession of the Dual down to the time of Aristotle, and G. Schmid in his *Atticismus* had called attention to its reappearance at the end of the first century of the Christian era; but it still remained to follow its fortunes during the intervening period. This has been now done with great care and industry by Hermann Schmidt, who thus states the general conclusions arrived at. The use of the dual in inscriptions died out in 329 B.C.; its use in literature about 100 B.C.; but under Augustus a revival took place, the first sign of which is visible in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who devoted so much attention to the study of the Attic historians and orators. From the tables supplied it appears that there are ninety examples of the dual in the works of Aristotle. Taking these as covering 3,000 Teubner pages, we get an average of three for every hundred pages (3 p.c.), while the pseudo-Aristotelian treatises have six in 1,400 pages (0.57 p.c.). Theophrastus has 2.2 p.c., Euclid none in 750 pages, Archimedes none in 400 pages, but pseudo-Euclides has 2.5 p.c., pseudo-Archimedes 3.3 p.c. Polybius has 2 p.c., Diodorus none in 2,200 pages, Strabo none in 1,170. Dionysius of Halicarnassus has 13 in 1,800 pages (0.7 p.c.), pseudo-Dionysius 6 in 30 pages (20 p.c.), Philo has 0.77, Josephus 1.15, Plutarch 1.1 and pseudo-Plutarch 2.7 p.c., Dio Chrysostom 6.4 and pseudo-Dio 26.6 p.c., while Timaeus Locrus has 7 in 14 pages (50 p.c.). Other tables are given showing what forms of the dual occur, and to what extent in each writer, whether alone or in conjunction with *δύο* or *ἄμφω*. From these we learn that the verbal dual, which is not found in inscriptions after B.C. 417, is absent from literature in the interval between Aristotle and Josephus, and that, out of the 90 instances of the dual in Aristotle's works, 79 are joined with either *δύο* or *ἄμφω*, implying, as Schmidt remarks, that the dual was scarcely strong enough to stand by itself. Even the presence of *δύο* or *ἄμφω* is not always enough to retain the dual in the noun, as we find in Aristotle (*Anal. Pr. ii. 11*) *ἐιλημμένων ἄμφω τῶν προτάσεων*. Perhaps it might have been well to distinguish here the case in which *ἄμφω* serves as the attribute of a subject, from such a case as *ἐξ ἄμφω ἀστῶν*, where *ἄμφω* stands for the subject and *ἀστῶν* is predicative ('where both are citizens'), since, the extension of the predicate being usually greater than that of the subject, the dual naturally changes to the plural in the latter case.

The forms of *δύο* are exhibited in a special table, from which it appears that Aristotle has 90 examples of G. *δυοῖν*, 8 of G. *δυνῖν*, and 80 of G. *δύο*, while for Dative he has 12 of *δυοῖν*, none of *δυνῖν*, 23 of *δύο* and 60 of *δυσί*. In Euclid the only form of the Genitive is *δύο*, which occurs 319 times: for the Dative he uses *δύο* 47 times and *δυσί* 137 times. Polybius never uses *δυοῖν*, but has 12 examples of G. *δυνῖν*, and 4 of G. *δύο*, while for Dative he uses *δυνῖν* once, *δύο* twice, and *δυσί* 17 times. Diodorus has 36 examples of G. *δυοῖν*, 12 of G. *δυνῖν*, 15 of G. *δύο*, using *δυσί* only for the Dat., of which he has 38 examples. Dionysius, who never uses *δυοῖν*, has 67 examples of G. *δυνῖν* and 10 of G. *δύο*, while he uses D. *δυνῖν* once, D. *δύο* twice, and D. *δυσί* 34 times. Strabo again never uses *δυοῖν*, but has 30 examples of G. *δυνῖν* and 4 of G. *δύο*, 1 of D. *δυνῖν* and 19 of D. *δυσί*. Plutarch has 69 of G. *δυοῖν*, 101 of G. *δυνῖν*, 17 of G. *δύο*, 2 of D. *δυοῖν*, and 49 of D. *δυσί*. J. B. M.

ΣΚΟΛΙΟΝ.

[The following attempt is to some extent a new departure in the art of Greek verse writing. The attempt is to turn the excellent drinking-song of Captain Morris, the friend and boon companion of the Prince Regent, into a Greek song in the metre of the famous *scolion* about Harmodius and Aristogiton. The Greek does not profess to be a literal translation of the English, which contains twice as many lines, but is intended

to illustrate how an ancient Greek song-writer might have treated the same theme. It aims at reproducing every substantive thought to be found in the original in the outspoken Greek manner; all euphemisms, pleonasms, and repetitions (except of course the refrain) being dispensed with, as well as such mere embellishments of language as the Greek style would, in the opinion of the translator, reject.]

THE TOPER'S APOLOGY.

I'm often ask'd by plodding souls
And men of sober tongue
What joy I take in draining bowls
And tipping all night long.
Now, tho' these cautious knaves I scorn,
For once I'll not disdain
To tell them why I sit till morn,
And fill my glass again.

'Tis by the glow my bumper gives
Life's picture's mellow made;
The fading light then brightly lives,
And softly sinks the shade;
Some happier tint still rises there
With every drop I drain;
And that's, I think, a reason fair
To fill my glass again.

My muse, too, when her wings are dry,
No frolic flight will take;
But round the bowl she'll dip and fly,
Like swallows round a lake;
Then, if the nymph will have her share
Before she'll bless her swain,
Why, that's, I think, a reason fair
To fill my glass again.

In life I've rung all changes through,
Run every pleasure down,
Tried each extreme of folly too,
And lived with half the town.
For me there's nothing new or rare
Till wine deceives my brain;
And that's, I think, a reason fair
To fill my glass again.

Many a lad I liked is dead,
And many a lass grown old;
And as the lesson strikes my head,
My weary heart grows cold.
But wine a while drives off despair,
Nay, bids a hope remain;
And that's, I think, a reason fair
To fill my glass again.

IDEM GRAECE REDDITUM.

μισῶ σῶφρον' ἑταῖρον ὅς μ' ἐρωτᾷ
τίπτε παννυχίαν ἀμυστιν ἔλκω·
διερῶ δ' ὅμως ὅττι μαθὼν
“κιννάτω” ἡμὶ “παῖς ζωρὸν ἀφειδέως.”

ζωῆς μέλιχ' ἀγάλλεται, φλέγει δέ,
ἦκα δ' αὖ μινύθει, φάος παρ' οἴνῳ,
γάννυμαι δὲ τόσσ' ὅσσα πῖω,
κιννάτω οὖν ὁ παῖς ζωρὸν ἀφειδέως.

ξηρὰ βλάξ πέλει, ἀλλὰ Μοῦσ' ἀλεισον
ὡς λίμνην περιπταται χελιδών,
κελέβης ἄρ' εἰ τῇδε μέτα,
κιννάτω οὖν ὁ παῖς ζωρὸν ἀφειδέως.

πολλῶν συμποσίων γεγεμένῳ μοι
πασῶν τ' ἀφροσύνῳ, ἔωλα πάντα
σαπρὰ τ' ἐστ' ἕως ἂν μεθύω,
κιννάτω οὖν ὁ παῖς ζωρὸν ἀφειδέως.

Ἄιδης τὸν μὲν ἔχει φίλων, τὸ γῆρας
τήνδ', ἀτὰρ πόθος οἶχεται, χαρὰ ζῆ,
κυλίκων πέριξ νισσομένων,
κιννάτω οὖν ὁ παῖς ζωρὸν ἀφειδέως.

I find, too, when I stint my glass,
And sit with sober air,
I'm prosed by some dull reasoning ass
Who treads the round of care;
Or, harder still, I'm doom'd to bear
Some coxcomb's fribbling strain;
And that's, I think, a reason fair
To fill my glass again.

Then, hipp'd and vex'd at England's fate
In these convulsive days,
I can't endure the ruin'd state
My sober eye surveys.
But through the bottle's dazzling glare
These ills I see less plain;
And that's, I think, a reason fair
To fill my glass again.

CHARLES MORRIS.

ἔθλους, εἴποτε φείδομαι κυλιχῶν,
οἷστέον πεπονημένους σοφιστῶν,
ἰδαρῇ τε κομψῶν λαλιάν,
κιννάτω οὖν ὁ παῖς ζωρὸν ἀφειδέως.

νῦν χειμαζομένων κάκιστ' Ἀθηνῶν
νήφων πάντα σαφῶς ὁρῶ φθαρέντα,
ἀσαφέστερον δ' ὥς βρέχομαι,
κιννάτω οὖν ὁ παῖς ζωρὸν ἀφειδέως.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

OBITUARY.

PROFESSOR NETTLESHIP.

HENRY NETTLESHIP was born in 1839, being the son of Henry Nettlehip, solicitor, of Kettering and the eldest of five brothers, three others of whom have won distinction, one as painter and critic, one as oculist, the youngest as philosopher till a sudden and fearful accident befell him last year in the Alps. He was sent to school first to Lancing, of which, despite differences of opinion, he retained a pleasant recollection, and subsequently to the Charterhouse, where he was a contemporary of Professor Jebb. In April 1857, when not quite eighteen, he matriculated as scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and as an undergraduate won a first in Moderations and a great number of University prizes, though, like some other distinguished men, he obtained a second in Greats. In 1861, after taking his degree, he became Fellow and soon Tutor of Lincoln College. In Oxford he came specially in contact with Prof. Conington and Mr. Mark Pattison: in Berlin, where he also studied, he was a pupil of Moriz Haupt. From 1868 to 1873 he held a mastership at Harrow, where he married the daughter of another Harrow master, the late Mr. Steel. In 1871 the third volume of Conington's 'Vergil' appeared and contained his first published work, the notes to Aeneid x. and xii. being principally composed by him. In 1873 he returned to Oxford to stay as Fellow of Corpus, and his activity as a scholar began

NO. LXIII. VOL. VII.

more definitely. He took his teacher Conington's 'Vergil' in charge and in 1875 published his 'Suggestions Introductory to a Study of the Aeneid,' while in the same year he undertook the arduous task of preparing in twelve years a new Latin Dictionary. In the next year he indicated his views on classical research and classical education in an essay contributed to a volume of 'Essays on the Endowment of Classical Research.' The book is now half-forgotten, but Mr. Nettleship's essay shows how much he had learnt from Mr. Pattison. In 1878, when Prof. E. Palmer accepted the archdeaconry of Oxford, he became Corpus Professor of Latin, a position which he held till his death. His activity for some years showed itself only in the new editions of Conington's 'Vergil' and 'Persius,' which contained a vast amount of careful work in detail, and in public lectures and pamphlets, such as a lecture on Haupt (1879), essays on the Roman Satira (1878), on Ancient Lives of Vergil (1879), a little book on Vergil contributed to Mr. Green's 'Classical Writers,' a preface to Mr. Steel's 'Sermons' (1882). In 1885 he revised and republished much previous work in an important volume of 'Lectures and Essays on Subjects connected with Latin Literature and Scholarship,' and in 1887 he published a large octavo of 'Contributions to Latin Lexicography,' the results of his twelve years' efforts towards a new Latin Dictionary. That task had, indeed, proved impossible.

C C

He had failed in getting the assistance for which he had hoped, and the days were gone by when one man could write a Dictionary single-handed. At the time of his death, he was engaged on an elaborate edition of Nonius, based upon materials left by his pupil Mr. J. H. Onions, student of Christ Church, who died in 1889. The work, as he conceived it, would have differed perhaps from that contemplated by Mr. Onions: it was, at any rate, a serious and thorough effort, as the two articles lately published in the 'Journal of Philology' sufficiently showed, and it is much to be hoped that the work of these two men will one day be adequately published.

Such is the dry outline of a great scholar's life. Of its details, others are more competent to write than I am, and I am glad to think that they will supply my intentional and unintentional deficiencies. For the understanding of such a life, it is above all needful to understand the character of the man, shy, sensitive, affectionate, always ready to help others, with singular width of view, and a noble ideal of scholarship. Of all this, others can speak best and most fittingly: others, too, can judge best of Mr. Nettleship's place as a scholar. The pupil may not suitably criticize the master, but, for myself, I do not hesitate to call him a great scholar. He was not perhaps—at least in manner—an effective lecturer to undergraduate audiences: when he had three or four pupils by himself in his own rooms, the inspiration was unmistakable and unforgettable. It was much the same with his published work. He printed little, and much that he printed is hidden in one commentary on Vergil. But for fine sense of scholarship and delicate literary feeling his essays are unequalled, and his 'Suggestions on the Study of the Aeneid' has been called the best book ever written about Vergil's poetry. As an interpreter of Vergil he stands in the front rank, the more so because his literary instincts never led him to overlook the dry bones of his subject. On the contrary, he had perhaps a better appreciation than any Vergilian editor of the conditions which attach to the textual criticism of the poet, and the essays which he added to Conington's commentary, essays dealing with ancient critics and commentators, as well as with the legends of Aeneas' wanderings and the epic cycle, show that he knew whence to seek matter for the text and interpretation of his author. These essays are, in some sense, characteristic of all his work. He

was willing to plunge deep into laborious and abstruse detail, but he kept throughout a clear sense of the ultimate meaning of it all. The defication of detail, the favourite fault of 'Kleinphilologie,' was his abhorrence. His researches into Latin glossaries, into Verrius Flaccus, Nonius, and the rest were carried through with the distinct consciousness that the results would illustrate the whole vocabulary of Latin as well as the efforts made by the Latins themselves to study their own language. Similarly he worked at Keil's 'Grammatici Latini' and at much else which the ordinary scholar leaves aside, and perhaps must leave aside. Sometimes perhaps this sense of the ideal end may have led him astray, not into any carelessness as to *minutiae* (of that he was never guilty), but into impracticable undertakings. This, at least, could be urged against his projected dictionary. Had he aimed solely at a scholarly revision of existing works, that is, at doing what nearly every dictionary writer before him had done as far back as Verrius Flaccus or further, he would have produced a most useful book and improved English scholarship. But he refused the lower ideal, and the result is a striking fragment. Yet, if we have lost, we have also gained. Mr. Nettleship's ideal of scholarship lifted him above any narrowness of aim. He had his special study of Vergil, but he was no Vergilian specialist, limited to the criticism of the one author. He was able alike to deal satisfactorily with Latin etymology, and to settle the meaning of a law term. And, perhaps, great as have been his individual services to the study of Latin literature and language, his greatest service of all has been the steadfast adherence to his ideal.

F. HAVERFIELD.

HAVING been intimately acquainted with the late Professor Nettleship for a period extending over thirty years, and having been his colleague at two colleges, I am glad to respond to the invitation of the Editor of the *Classical Review* to add to this notice a few lines stating my impressions of his character and attainments. On consulting the Lincoln books, I find that Nettleship was admitted to his Probationary Fellowship by myself on January 20, 1862, but, as it has always been the custom at Lincoln to defer the admission of a Fellow till about a month after his election, in order, it used to be said, to provide for the

contingency of an appeal, he must have been elected on or about December 20, 1861. I well recollect the circumstances of his election. Though he had only been placed in the second class in the examination in *Literis Humanioribus* of the previous summer term, he decidedly outdistanced his competitors, all of whom, if I recollect rightly, were first classmen. The subject in which he was pre-eminent was, of course, classical scholarship, but his answers in philosophy, history, and general literature also exhibited intellectual vigour, sound sense, and extensive knowledge. It is a curious coincidence that the College had on the two previous occasions (in the case of Dr. Merry, the present Rector, and Mr. Donald Crawford, now M.P. for N.E. Lanarkshire) elected second classmen, though several first classmen were amongst the candidates. At Oriel, as is well known, a similar result has been by no means uncommon. But to any one thoroughly familiar with the Oxford system of examinations, this apparent divergence of opinion occasions no difficulty, as the electors to a Fellowship are plainly justified in ascribing more importance to promise, general intellectual ability, and pronounced excellence in some particular department of knowledge, than the Examiners in the "Schools," whose principal business it is to test the candidates in the prepared work of a given curriculum. Soon after Nettleship's election to his Fellowship, he was appointed to one of the Classical Tutorships, an office which he executed with the utmost fidelity and acceptance. His pupils were loud in praise of his untiring assiduity, his constant readiness to assist them in their private work, his friendliness, and his skilfulness as a teacher. Nor did he succumb to the common temptation of so many masters, tutors, and professors, by concentrating his attention on his more promising pupils. The dullest passman shared his attention equally with the cleverest and ablest scholar. Lincoln had, at that time, the rare good fortune to possess as its classical tutors both Nettleship and the present Rector (Dr. Merry), who was Nettleship's senior in the tuition by two or three years. As the result of their combined efforts, the success of the college in the Moderations Schools, on the subjects of which they mainly lectured, was so striking, considering the smallness of the numbers and the slenderness of the endowments, as to excite the general attention of the University. In this mode of life, about equally distributed

between teaching and reading (for, notwithstanding the manifold distractions of Oxford residence, he always succeeded in maintaining the character of a student), Nettleship continued till the summer of 1868, when he accepted an Assistant-mastership at Harrow. The main reason of this change was, I surmise though I do not know positively, the uncertainty of the tenure of his Fellowship, which, unless he had taken Holy Orders, would, under ordinary circumstances, have determined at the end of eleven years from his election. In the Michaelmas Term of 1873, having married meanwhile, he was recalled to Oxford as Fellow of his original college, Corpus, and joint Classical Lecturer of Corpus and Christ Church. From this position he was promoted to the Corpus Professorship of Latin in June, 1878. By my election to the Presidency of Corpus at the close of 1881, we again became colleagues, and though, from the mere fact of our both occupying houses at some distance from each other instead of both occupying rooms under the same roof, we necessarily saw less of each other than in the old Lincoln days, I trust our friendship and mutual regard was in no way diminished.

I ought not to omit to notice that the specially critical direction taken by Nettleship's classical studies was probably largely determined by a prolonged stay which he made at Berlin during the period of his Lincoln Tutorship. If I recollect rightly, this visit was suggested to him by Mr. Mark Pattison, then Rector of the college, whose example and sympathy, I have no doubt, contributed to the same result.

Though Nettleship was *par excellence* a philologist and classical scholar, it would be a great mistake to suppose that his studies or interests were limited by his professional pursuits. He was an accomplished pianofortist, and much interested in the history and theory of music. He was widely read and deeply interested in modern literature, specially English and German. Roman law, Roman history, Roman religion, and Roman philosophy he regarded as falling within the scope of his Latin studies. Modern philosophical speculation, though he did not pretend to be widely versed in its literature, was always an attractive subject to him. He was always glad to discuss, or at least to converse on, the differences between the rival schools of philosophy which have so long divided, and, in some form or other, will probably long continue to divide, the more reflective intellects of Oxford. In these discussions, which, in the earlier days

of our intercourse, were not infrequent, what always impressed me most was Nettleship's candour, his entire absence of bitterness or partisanship, his readiness to acknowledge a mistake or misconception, and his constant desire to find out points of agreement and minimise points of difference—surely the essential characteristic of the truly philosophic temperament! This sketch of his intellectual interests would be incomplete, were I not to mention the keen interest which he took in politics. He was an ardent, though not an intolerant, Liberal, and, when the Liberal party was divided by the introduction of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill in 1885, he warmly espoused the side of the Liberal Unionists. During the later years of his life, he was also much interested in some of the social questions of the time, such as popular education, the higher education of women, and trades-unionism, especially in its relation to female workers.

The moral and emotional side of Nettleship's nature was strong and deep. During one of our first walks, I was much struck by the affectionateness and tenderness of his disposition, a characteristic which I am glad to see pointedly noticed in the excellent obituary article in the *Times* of July 11. He had a strong sense of injustice. The only occasions on which I have seen him indignant were at two or three college meetings where it was proposed to deal, as he conceived, harshly and unjustly with undergraduates or college servants. As a rule, his manner was peculiarly sweet and conciliatory. This amiable characteristic, together with his natural shyness and diffidence, and a certain hesitancy of manner, sometimes led to the supposition (an erroneous one, I always thought) that he was not fitted for the conduct of practical affairs. On the other hand, I always thought his practical judgment remarkably clear, impartial, and penetrating. Thus, though he was undoubtedly somewhat inclined to hero-worship, I never knew his admiration for literary or intellectual excellence bias his opinion where important practical issues were at stake, or where the oracle transcended the sphere of its competence. Indeed, if I were confined in my delineation of his character to a single clause, I should say that what specially distinguished it was the singular combination of independence of judgment with modesty of manner and feeling.

As I write these lines, I am pervaded with a deep sense of the grave loss sus-

tained, through the death of my friend, alike by my college, by my University, and by the world of letters.

T. FOWLER.

H. D. DARBISHIRE.

WE regret to record the loss that we have sustained by the death of one of our most valued contributors, Mr. Herbert Dukinfield Darbishire, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. He died on Tuesday, July 18, at the early age of thirty, only a few days after coming into residence for the Long Vacation with a view to giving a course of lectures on Comparative Philology. He had recently gone to Hunstanton for a change of air; during his absence he caught a chill which was followed by an attack of pleurisy. He was recovering from this, when a sudden and unexpected hæmorrhage from the lungs took place, and he died in a few minutes. Dr. MacAlister, who had attended him in his illness, was alone with him at the time of his decease.

Mr. Darbishire was born at Belfast, and received his early education at the Royal Academical Institution in that city. He afterwards entered the Queen's College, Belfast, where his career began in 1880 by his winning the Sullivan Scholarship, and ended in 1883 with his attaining a Senior Scholarship in Greek, Latin, and Ancient History. In the same year he obtained a first class with honours in Classics in the examination for the degree of B.A. in the Royal University of Ireland. In October, 1884, he came into residence at St. John's College, Cambridge. He had already given good proof of his proficiency in Classics at the Examination for Entrance Scholarships, but want of practice in Verse Composition prevented his attaining the place to which his general merits might well have entitled him. To the same cause it was due that, when he presented himself for the first part of the Classical Tripos at the end of his second year, he was placed in the second class, though in the first division of that class. Two years afterwards, in 1888, he was in the first class of the second part of the Classical Tripos, the subjects for which he obtained that position being classical scholarship and comparative philology. Meanwhile he had been elected to a foundation scholarship. In January, 1889, he was elected to a McMahon law studentship, which he held for the full term of four years. He

read for the Bar in the chambers of Mr. J. G. Butcher, now M.P. for York. In November, 1892, he was elected to a fellowship at his College, and was called to the Bar shortly after.

At Cambridge he had devoted much of his time to the study of Greek philosophy, but it was as a comparative philologist that he showed the highest promise. Several of his papers were published in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*. His 'Notes on the *Spiritus Asper* in Greek,' together with some contributions to Greek lexicography (*ἐπιδέξιος*, *ἐνδέξιος*, &c.), appeared in 1890; and his paper on the Indo-European names for Fox and Wolf, in 1892. To the *Journal of Philology* he contributed an article on the 'Numasioi Inscription,' and to the *Classical Review* a paper on 'Abnormal Derivations,' besides several reviews and the Index for the year 1888.

In 1891, when the Readership of Comparative Philology at Cambridge was vacated by the resignation of Dr. Peile, Mr. Darbishire was urged to be a candidate for the office; of all the candidates, he was the youngest, but he was acknowledged by competent authorities to be also one of the ablest. He had already begun to make his mark as a philological investigator and as a teacher. As a private tutor, during several Long Vacations, he gave courses of lectures on the Elements of Comparative Philology. These lectures were highly valued by those who had the privilege of attending them, and the same course was delivered at Girton College. The Principal of the latter wrote as follows on hearing the announcement of his death: 'We have seldom had a lecturer who has inspired his pupils with greater admiration for his methods and greater confidence in his knowledge; and even those who have known him for a short time only, feel that they have sustained a great loss in his death.'

Mr. Darbishire won the affection and admiration of his many friends by the singular beauty of his character, and also by the unwavering courage and the perfect good temper with which he struggled against physical weakness resulting from an accident which befell him in early life. The brightness of his intellectual ability, as well as the dignity of his bearing, and the charming and unaffected courtesy of his manner, will long be remembered by all who knew him.

I quote the following from an appreciative tribute to Mr. Darbishire's memory which appeared in the *Athenaeum* for July 29:—

'He was one of the most promising, if not the most promising, of British comparative philologists, and might have been expected to found a new school. His papers published in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society* and in the *Classical Review* display singular acumen and originality, together with a thorough grasp of sound scientific method; his separately published "Notes on the *Spiritus Asper* in Greek" is quite a model. Mr. Darbishire was also an excellent classical scholar and critic. His very attractive character was ennobled by the modest dignity and cheerful courage with which he bore serious physical disadvantages entailed by an accident during infancy. His intellectual power and brightness, his rare charm of manner, his wit, and his genial mood, made him a delightful companion and he was a prime favourite with children.'

I append an extract from Dr. Postgate's notice in the *Academy* of the same date:—

(His dissertation entitled 'Notes on the *Spiritus Asper*') 'was a very remarkable performance; especially noteworthy was the way in which it used hitherto unobserved coincidences in Greek and Armenian, (the correspondence) of the *spiritus lenis* to Armenian *g*, and of the *spiritus asper* to Armenian *v*, to distinguish two different *w*'s in the parent language. All his contributions to the *Classical Review*, and other learned publications, showed the same acuteness of vision and freshness of treatment...

'He was an excellent teacher; and it was a matter of some regret when he left us for the Bar, though there is no question that his acumen and subtlety admirably qualified him for that profession.'

'Mr. Darbishire, as all his friends can testify, was a man of a singularly modest and amiable character. His loss makes us sadly feel, in the words of Horace,

"neque candidiores
terra tulit, neque quis me sit devinctior alter."

It remains to be added that, after the funeral service in St. John's College Chapel, a hope was expressed on the part of friends from other Colleges, that it might prove possible to arrange for the publication of Mr. Darbishire's papers in a collective form. His books and manuscripts have been accordingly placed in my hands by members of his family, and have been examined with the aid of Mr. R. A. Neil, Fellow of Pembroke, and Mr. R. S. Conway, Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, and now Professor of Latin at Cardiff. Mr. Darbishire's work has met with due recognition abroad at the hands of M. Victor Henry in France, and Professor Brugmann in Germany; and it is hoped that, under the editorial care of Professor Conway, a small volume containing about a dozen of Mr. Darbishire's published or unpublished papers may possibly be put together. Such a volume would serve as a fitting memorial of a philologist whose early death is lamented in more than one seat of learning in the United Kingdom.

J. E. SANDY.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE HARBOURS OF CARTHAGE.

In the *Classical Review* for June 1891 there was an article of mine on the Harbours of Carthage. This article has been discussed by Dr. Raimund Oehler in a paper read before the Archäologische Gesellschaft at Berlin in March 1893, and since published in the *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, 1893, pp. 321-332. He agrees with some of my conclusions, and dissents from others.

The old theory was briefly this. Southward of the citadel of Carthage there are two large ponds in the low ground between the hill and the shore. The northern pond was originally circular, with a circular island in the middle, and formed the harbour for the fleet. The southern pond was originally rectangular, and formed the mercantile harbour. There was a canal between the two harbours, and another from the mercantile harbour to the sea.

My theory is that the ponds have nothing whatever to do with the harbours. I am of opinion that the outer harbour was formed by piers in the sea; and also of opinion that the inner harbour was nearly surrounded by the outer harbour, but that its position is otherwise unknown.

Dr. Oehler accepts my view that the outer harbour was formed by piers in the sea. But he maintains that the two ponds together represent the inner harbour.

My purpose here is to deal with the points on which we differ.

A. I believe that the term *Cothon* was applied to the outer or mercantile harbour. Dr. Oehler believes that it was applied to the inner or military harbour.

Strabo speaks of the mouth of the *Cothon*, xvii. 3. 15, in mentioning the entrance which Appian describes in detail as the mouth of the outer harbour, viii. 121, cf. 96. Dr. Oehler has not met this argument.

In commenting on Virgil, *Aeneid*, i. 427, *hic portus alii effodiunt*, Servius interprets *portus effodiunt* as *Cothona faciunt*, and adds *Carthaginenses Cothone fossa utuntur, non naturali portu*. On the other hand, Festus says *Cothones appellantur portus in mari interiores, arte et manu facti*. After quoting these passages Dr. Oehler asserts that aus diesen Stellen geht hervor, dass die Alten unter *Kothon* ein am Meere gelegenes, künstlich im Ufer ausgeschachtetes Hafenbecken ver-

standen. But to speak here of a harbour *im Ufer* is to treat *in mari* as equivalent to *in terra*; and to speak of a harbour *am Meere* is to ignore *in mari* altogether. Every harbour must be more or less *am Meere*: but some peculiarity is indicated by the words *in mari*. Dr. Oehler does not construe *in mari interiores* as a single phrase, but takes *interiores* by itself, and argues from that word that the *Cothon* was the inner harbour. But then the phrase *in mari* would prove that the inner harbour was not an excavation on the shore. No doubt, Virgil says that the first settlers at Carthage excavated harbours on the shore; but he does not use the name *Cothon*. It is only the commentator, Servius, who connects that name with those excavated harbours: so Dr. Oehler's account of the opinions of *die Alten* seems to rest entirely on this passage in Servius, which is flatly contradicted by the passage in Festus, to say nothing of other testimony. Festus says plainly that *Cothons* were artificial harbours in the sea; and artificial harbours in the sea are necessarily formed by piers. And then, in speaking of the outer harbour at Carthage, Appian says that the entrance was not very far from the land, viii. 121; thereby implying that the entrance was some little way from the land, and consequently between two piers.

Appian says that when the Romans began to block the entrance to the outer harbour by throwing out a pier, the Carthaginians cut a new entrance at the other end of the harbour, where the water was too deep and the weather too boisterous for the Romans to attempt to build a pier, viii. 121. From this Dr. Oehler infers that the *Cothon* was an excavation on the shore; arguing that the conditions which prevented the Romans from building a pier to block the new entrance, would also have prevented the Carthaginians from building a pier there to form a harbour. But if the Romans had tried to build a pier to block the new entrance, they must have built it considerably further from the shore than the pier through which this entrance presumably was cut. Now the coast is too much silted here for any one to guess the depth of water in ancient times: but, as a rule, the depth increases with the distance from the shore; and very often it is easy enough to carry a pier along the three-fathom line, where

it would practically be impossible to carry one along the five-fathom line a little further out. Dr. Oehler admits that the outer harbour was formed by piers; but he supposes that the inner harbour extended along the coast beyond the limits of the outer harbour, with only a narrow neck of land between it and the open sea, and that the new entrance pierced this neck of land. But then the Carthaginians would surely have cut an entrance there before, to let ships sail straight into the inner harbour without the trouble and delay of passing through the outer harbour. As for the name Cothon, there is nothing here to connect it with one harbour or the other.

The name Cothon is not given to any harbour away from Carthage except the harbour of Hadrumetum; and that harbour is formed by piers. Dr. Oehler replies that *so lange keine umfassenden Ausgrabungen in Hadrumetum angestellt sind, bleibt es unsicher, ob der von Torr beschriebene Hafen der einzige und somit der Kothon war*. But the passages in the *Bellum Africanum*, 62, 63, go to prove that if the Cothon was not the only harbour there, it was certainly the outer harbour.

The harbours of Utica very probably resembled those of Carthage; and certain remains at Utica have been attributed to an excavated harbour with an island in the middle. But there are similar remains at Carthage; and an inscription shows that they belong to the baths, and represent a central structure with a large enclosure round, like the baths of Caracalla at Rome. Dr. Oehler replies that *aus der Aehnlichkeit des Grundrisses allein ist kein zwingender Beweis abzuleiten: hier können nur umfassende Ausgrabungen entscheiden*. But the resemblance goes far beyond the ground-plan, and shows that the buildings are of the same design and date.¹ Now, at Utica the current topography is based on the assumption that the former coast-line is marked by the edge of the marsh; and apart from that assumption, there is nothing to suggest that the sea ever ran into the alleged harbour. But the assumption is untenable; for the marsh runs right into the orchestra of the theatre, and must therefore overlap the former coast-line. Dr. Oehler replies *aber Sümpfe können sich doch mit der Zeit vergrößern*. That is quite true: but I fail to see its bearing on the point. Dr. Oehler then proceeds to inquire *wie findet sich übrigens*

Torr mit der Thatsache ab, dass in einem der Schiffsschuppen ein vierarmiger antiker Anker gefunden worden ist? Dr. Oehler is following an authority² who is seldom trustworthy; and he goes beyond his authority in asserting as a *Thatsache* that it was an ancient anchor. M. Daux merely says that *il est présumable qu'elle appartenait à l'époque romaine*. Four-armed anchors were in use in the Middle Ages; but not, so far as I know, in the Roman Period. And then M. Daux says that the anchor was found some years before he went to Utica. He never saw it himself; and merely heard a tale of its discovery in what he calls *un des magasins ou cales de la rangée inférieure du fond du port*. Dr. Oehler translates *cales* and ignores *magasins*: but to talk of these ruins as *Schiffsschuppen* is simply to beg the question, the question being whether they have anything to do with an ancient harbour. And even if they had, that would only show that there was an excavated harbour on the shore at Utica, not that this harbour was a Cothon.³

B. Believing that the Cothon was the outer harbour and was formed by piers, I suppose that the square part (*τετραγωνον*) was on the south side and continued the line of fortifications which formed the *γωνία*, while the round part (*περιφερές*) was on the north side and continued the curve of the hills. Believing that the Cothon was the inner harbour and was created by excavation, Dr. Oehler supposes that the square part is represented by the southern pond, which is nearly square, while the round part is represented by the northern pond, which is nearly round.

Appian says that the Romans carried the fortifications of the Cothon by an unexpected attack on the round part while their main force was threatening the square part; and that they then fought their way through the market-place and along the streets up to the Byrsa, viii. 127, 128. But if the round part is represented by the northern pond, the Romans were not in a position to attack the round part. Dr. Oehler asserts that they made the attack from *die nördliche Verlängerung des Hafenbollwerks*, fixing the position of this *Verlängerung* by a reference to Falbe's map,

² Daux, *Recherches sur l'origine et l'emplacement des emporia phéniciens*, p. 172.

³ I saw some mediæval anchors outside the mosque of Sidi Amir Abâdah at Kairwân, and was told that they were brought there from Porto Farina forty years ago. Porto Farina is close to Utica: so this may be a variant of the story told to M. Daux.

¹ I infer from Dr. Oehler's remarks that he has not visited Hadrumetum or Utica or even Carthage.

n. 50—n. 99. But he does not explain how the Romans could have established themselves in that position, or why they should have used it as a base for an attack on fortifications down by the northern pond. With that position in their hands, the Romans could have seized the Byrsa without going near the northern pond.

There was a Cothon at Hadrumetum; and the remains of the piers show that they enclosed a harbour that was square at one end and round at the other. Dr. Oehler has not touched this point.

C. I think the northern pond too small to represent a harbour containing docks for 220 ships. Dr. Oehler does not think it necessarily too small; and maintains that, even if it is, there was ample room for the docks in a double harbour represented by the pair of ponds.

My reckoning was that, if the Carthaginian docks were of the same dimensions as the Athenian docks of the same date, they would have needed a frontage of at least 5638 feet, where no more than 4442 was available. Dr. Oehler objects that, although the Carthaginians had ships of various sizes, I have made all the docks of the same size. But I imagine that, as a rule, the ancients made their docks of a size to take their biggest ships, and thus had them available for any ships that wanted docking. Dr. Oehler asserts that *dagegen sprechen die seitens des deutschen archäologischen Instituts in Munychia und Zea und die seitens Cavallaris in Syrakus angestellten Messungen*; and he refers to three authorities.¹ But, according to those authorities, the measurement from centre to centre is uniformly 6.25 metres in the docks at Munychia; and varies only from 6.47 to 6.54 in the docks at Zea. And for Syracuse the statement is *dass 2.50 bis über 6 m. breite parallele Gräben, zwischen denen senkrechte 0.60 m. dicke Wände stehen gelassen sind, nach dem Tiefwasser des Hafens laufen*. But at Athens there was not only a wall between each pair of docks, but a wall along the middle of each dock to take the keel. And if that was so at Syracuse, a pair of Gräben of 2.50 each together with a Wand of 0.60 would go to a single dock; so that, with the Wände at the sides, the distance from centre to centre would be 6.20. Dr. Oehler takes 3.10 as a basis in his calculations. According to Dörpfeld's

¹ Dörpfeld, in the *πρακτικά τῆς ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐταιρίας* for 1885, pp. 63 ff.; von Alten, in the *Karten von Attika*, i. 14; and Lupus, *Stadt Syrakus im Alterthum*, p. 26.

plan in the *πρακτικά*, plate 2, some of the docks at Zea are still 43.88 in length, and originally were longer. And as all these docks are of nearly equal width, they were presumably of nearly equal length. Dr. Oehler asserts that the length varied from 21.2 to 40.0. I do not find those figures in the authorities he cites: but it seems clear that he is reckoning the remaining portion as the whole, and thus under-estimating the amount of space required.²

Dr. Oehler urges that there would be space enough for the docks in a double harbour represented by the pair of ponds. But Strabo, xvii. 3. 14, speaks only of docks in a circular harbour; and Dr. Oehler identifies that with the northern pond. And then Appian, viii. 96, talks as though all the docks could be seen at a glance; and that would be out of the question, if they were divided between two such harbours as Dr. Oehler imagines.

Appian says that in the docks at Carthage each shed had two Ionic columns in front, and these columns gave the frontage the appearance of a portico, viii. 96. Now, the docks at Zea are divided by lines of columns; and the columns are spaced differently in alternate lines, as if to carry different weights. So these docks were roofed in pairs; each shed having two lines of columns underneath, and therefore displaying two columns at the end. And as the docks were in a row, [the final columns of the several lines would form a kind of portico along the front. To my mind this suggests a simple explanation of the passage in Appian; but Dr. Oehler adopts M. Beulé's explanation.³ M. Beulé found the remains of some engaged columns near the northern pond, and attributed them to the frontage of the docks; arguing that this frontage must have been composed of engaged columns, since Appian only says that it had the appearance of being a *στοά*, whereas he would have said it was a *στοά*, had it been composed of columns standing by themselves. But surely Appian is using *στοά* in the ordinary way to denote a portico where people could stroll about and chat; and only means that the place looked like a *στοά*, but could not be used as such, since the columns went below the water-line.

² I suspect that Dr. Oehler is quoting at second hand from Hermann's *Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten*, vol. 2, part 2, p. 279. The same figures occur there, and the same authorities are cited. But the figures are given as measurements of the length now extant; and the 40.0 is qualified by *εἶσα*.

³ Beulé, *Fouilles à Carthage*, p. 110.

And, apart from M. Beulé's interpretation of Appian, there is nothing to suggest that those engaged columns came from the docks; and that the docks must therefore have been near the northern pond.

D. The ruins which I assign to the pier at the southern end of the outer harbour, are assigned by Dr. Oehler to the pier at its northern end.

The outer harbour was the mercantile harbour; and such a city as Carthage would require a mercantile harbour of considerable extent. Dr. Oehler has to admit that, on his hypothesis, this harbour would be singularly small. To this objection he merely replies that merchantmen need not have used a harbour, as they could anchor in the roads. And then, in a footnote, he suggests that the mercantile harbour may have extended beyond the limits he assigns, and even reached the Lake of Tunis. But it cannot have reached the Lake of Tunis; for Appian says that the Romans carried their entrenchments across the promontory from sea to sea, viii. 119, so that their lines must have passed between the harbours and the lake.

Appian speaks of a pier that was defended by a stockade at the end abutting on the land; and says that eventually the Romans forced the stockade, and established themselves on this pier, viii. 123—125. Dr. Oehler supposes that the Romans thus established themselves in the position marked n. 44, 45, 46, 47 on Falbe's map: and I concur. But, on my hypothesis, this was a portion of the pier at the southern end of the outer harbour, and therefore connected with the land to the south of the city: whereas, on his hypothesis, it was a portion of the pier at the northern end of the outer harbour, and therefore separated from the land to the south by the whole width of that harbour. But unless this pier was connected with the land to the south, it was not open to attack by land from any point except the city itself: and the Romans could not attack it from there.

E. I believe that the inner harbour was nearly surrounded by the outer harbour. Dr. Oehler believes that they simply lay alongside one another.

Appian says that there were *πύλαι* which carried the merchants from the outer harbour into the city without passing through the inner harbour, viii. 96. I cited authorities to show that *πύλαι* can

sometimes mean *channels*; and argued that the inner harbour lay between two channels extending from the outer harbour to the city. Dr. Oehler merely asserts that *die Kaufleute gelangten durch Thore direct in die Stadt, ohne den Kriegshafen zu betreten*. But then Appian's statement would be pointless. If the merchants had only to walk through gates to get to the city, there would have been no question of passing through the inner harbour.

Diodoros says that the harbour of Charmuthas was very like the Cothon at Carthage, iii. 44. I gave reasons for identifying Charmuthas with Sherm Yenbo'; and pointed out that Sherm Yenbo' consists of a harbour opening on the sea, an inner harbour with an island, and a pair of channels branching from the outer harbour. Dr. Oehler objects that Sherm Yenbo' is a natural harbour, whereas the harbours at Carthage were artificial; as though that made all comparison impossible. But there is nothing to suggest that Charmuthas was an artificial harbour. Had it been artificial, Diodoros would certainly have noted the fact.

In describing the harbours of Atlantis in the *Critias*, 113—117, Plato speaks of a harbour opening on the sea, an inner harbour with an island, and a pair of channels branching from the outer harbour; and states that the outer harbour and the channels together formed the mercantile harbour, while the inner harbour was reserved for men-of-war. I suggested grounds for thinking that Plato had Carthage in his mind, when writing this description. Dr. Oehler objects that all these harbours of Atlantis had been created by excavation, whereas at Carthage the outer harbour was formed by piers. But surely Plato might have Carthage in his mind, without describing every feature that existed in his own days. His story is that the dwellers in Atlantis excavated harbours there in by-gone ages; and this tallies with Virgil's story that harbours were excavated at Carthage by the followers of Dido.

I trust that, in dealing with these points, I have not misinterpreted any of Dr. Oehler's views; though I cannot but suspect that, as regards the military questions noticed under headings B and D, Dr. Oehler may be reasoning on some hypothesis which I have failed to comprehend.

CECIL TORR.

GARDNER'S NEW CHAPTERS IN
GREEK HISTORY.

New Chapters in Greek History. Historical Results of recent Excavations in Greece and Asia Minor, by PERCY GARDNER, M.A., Litt. D., Lincoln and Merton Professor of Classical Archaeology and Art, Oxford; late Disney Professor of Archaeology, Cambridge. With Illustrations. Pp. xv. 459. London: John Murray, Albermarle Street. 1892. 15s.

THIS book, which has probably already reached everybody interested in Greek Archaeology, follows closely upon two other books covering more or less the same field, Dyer's *Gods in Greece* and Diehl's *Excursions Archéologiques en Grèce*, lately translated into English, and is like them evoked by the natural desire to sum up the advances of Greek Archaeology during the last twenty years.

When one reads in such a work as Tozer's *Lectures on the Geography of Greece*, published just twenty years ago, that Olympia is still covered by the sands of the Cladeus, that the whereabouts of Dodona are uncertain, and that the remains of Mycenae are 'still visible,' in spite of Strabo's statement to the contrary, one hardly knows whether to give way to amusement at the darkness in which the archaeological world was then groping or to amazement at the light which has now come over it. No one can be surprised that more than one person has felt impelled to tell in his own way something of that wonderful story of these twenty years. The question of priority between the three books mentioned, even if it were important, might be difficult of settlement: for each of them has been several years in forming, growing out of lectures and magazine articles. But no one will regret that Professor Gardner's book has entered the field.

The work is professedly popular, and the nature of the material treated has necessitated its form, viz. a series of topics treated disconnectedly. Perhaps a book so constructed cannot be a 'great book.' But it is great good fortune to have these topics treated with such scholarship and such good judgment as Professor Gardner brings to the task.

There are several chapters in this book, the ground of which is not covered by either Diehl or Dyer. For these we may be especially thankful. From the chapter entitled Verification of Ancient History

the impulse to quote is almost irresistible, so full is it of sound historical sense. But self-denial being prescribed here, let us note but a single passage, treating of a duty of the historian which some would not think of as included in his functions.

'Beside the stream of actual history of the past runs another stream of ideal history, the course not of that which has really taken place, but of that which is supposed to have taken place. It may often turn out that beliefs as to what took place, though not corresponding to the facts, yet exercised a greater political and social influence than the facts themselves. The contemporaries of Miltiades and Alexander believed that the Trojan War was historical fact, and that belief of theirs exercised an enormous effect on their political and military actions' (pp. 5, 6).

Not only this first chapter but the whole book, although such a thought was probably far from the mind of the writer, affords a yield of archaeological aphorisms. A few examples may be cited. 'In archaeology it is always unsafe to draw conclusions from a few specimens' (p. 52). 'We cannot of course prove the *Iliad* to be history; and if we could, the world would be poorer than before' (p. 83). 'It is always unsafe to argue from a likeness or difference in artwork to identity or difference of race' (p. 89). 'For ourselves, we are often disposed to take the part of Herodotus against modern criticism, which is apt to err through supposing that people in ancient days always acted reasonably, and valued motives according to the scale of Bentham' (p. 189). 'A vase bears the same relation to a sculptured relief which a diary bears to a formal historical treatise' (p. 253). 'The effects of belief, even if that belief be placed on insecure grounds, may often be solid enough' (said of the cures at Epidauros, p. 362). 'There is but a step from the belief that all religions are true to the belief that all religions are false' (p. 448).

For the last chapter, The Successors of Alexander, although it is largely a condensation of Droysen, the author's justification, 'the desire to call more general attention to a period of history, with regard to which the general level of knowledge is very low, and yet which is remarkably full of instruction for modern times,' is more than sufficient. The chapter, Recent Discoveries and the Homeric Poems, is also one of the most timely and valuable.

The principle on which the topics are selected is not always quite clear. The alleged

reason for omitting Delos, viz. that it had already been treated by Dyer, is hardly adequate, for the omission leaves a sort of incompleteness; and then why should not Epidaurus and Eleusis have been omitted on the same ground? Perhaps the fact that the author had not already worked up Delos in a magazine article had something to do with this omission. Cyprus and Naukratis are perhaps included on the score of patriotism, as Dyer includes Icaria, and Diehl the temple of Apollo Ptoös. A brother's interest in the excavations at Naukratis and Paphos may also have been active. But in no case except in the omission of Delos have we any cause to regret the author's selection of topics.

It would be a marvel if a book touching on so many subjects should escape all errors. The following seem to be cases calling for correction. 'Aphrodite and Paris' (p. 33) should be Aphrodite and Anchises, judging by p. 155, where we have 'Anchises and Aphrodite' grouped with some of the same couples which appear in the former passage. The statement in regard to the circle at Mycenae in which Schliemann found the shaft-graves, 'It is patent to every one who looks at the plan of Mycenae that this circle cannot have been made while the Acropolis was in use as a dwelling-place. It entirely blocks the way to the great Lion-gate, which was the principal entrance to the citadel' (p. 79), needs revising not by any plan, but by autopsy. Professor Gardner must have been influenced by a temporary wave of enthusiasm for the *Cypria* when he wrote, 'The *Iliad* seems to have fallen from the clouds; none can clearly see why it begins where it does, and why it ends where it does' (p. 160). Whatever views have prevailed as to the origin of the *Iliad*, few have refused to accept it as a finished epic subject. In stating that Mardonius, on the second visit of the Persians to Athens, 'levelled with the ground whatever still remained standing, walls, houses, temples, and statues' (p. 240), the author is, to be sure, only repeating Herodotus. But it has usually been felt that Herodotus, as far as temples at least were concerned, is speaking somewhat rhetorically, and needs correction. Destruction of Greek cities, e.g. Corinth, did not imply an absolute levelling. If more specific proof were required in the present case, one might point to the fact that *συνγόμενος*, used of Mardonius's ravages, is the same word which is used (Hdt. viii. 144) of the ravages of Xerxes, after which the existence of a temple on the Acropolis

is expressly mentioned (Hdt. viii. 55). The statement in regard to the female statues from the Athenian Acropolis, that they 'have nothing of individual character in them' (p. 250), would not apply to all of them. One at least has almost the appearance of an Ethiopian.

In a few cases Professor Gardner has advanced views which he can hardly expect will gain much favour. In fact he seems inclined to admit this in the case of his view in regard to the relation between the shaft-graves and the beehive tombs at Mycenae, which is that the former were extemporized to receive the contents of the latter in some time of danger (p. 77). He is conscious that he is reversing the usual verdict of archaeologists as to the relative antiquity of the two kinds of tombs; so there is no need to appeal to that verdict: but the arguments by which he supports his theory lack foundation. In the first place the evidence of partial burning of the bodies in the shaft-graves and other signs of hasty burial have proved entirely elusive. See Schuchhardt, *Schliemann's Excavations* (Sellers), p. 162, 3, to say nothing of the fact that such deep cuttings in the rock are no work of haste. In the second place the asserted coincidence between the number of the beehive tombs and the number of the shaft-graves ignores the fact that Tsountas in his excavations of 1887-88 found a *seventh* beehive tomb. See Schuchhardt, *Schliemann's Excavations* (Sellers), p. 294. An important suggestion is made (p. 53) that the burnt city at Hissarlik may be a Syro-Cappadocian settlement, but as this is not held as a theory capable of proof, it may be passed without comment.

Doubtless the view maintained of the simplicity of the ceremonies at Eleusis (pp. 393-402) is correct: but it is quite another thing to prove that these ceremonies produced only superficial results. Is it not here the juster course to be like Dyer, enthusiastic along with Sophocles and Plato and Plutarch? Men in all ages have shown themselves prone to listen to the 'pleasing hope,' and when it enters the soul it works wonders. May we not still believe with Dyer, that 'the yearly procession of the living mystae was often thought of as a foretaste of the life beyond—a rehearsal or promise in this world of the performance in the world to come'?

It is gratifying to read Professor Gardner's judicious estimate of Dr. Dörpfeld as 'a man whose patience, science, and enthusiasm are alike remarkable; a man

who has shed upon all sites where he has worked a flood of new light, and who possesses in a rare degree the power of interesting and convincing others...with the generosity common among the best sort of savants' (pp. 233, 235). Yet after quoting Dörpfeld's expressed view that the case-mates at Tiryns point to Phoenician builders, he adds: 'These words were written before the palaces at Mycenae and elsewhere were found, and it is not likely that Dr. Dörpfeld still holds the opinion expressed in them' (p. 113). My own impression is that Dörpfeld has not changed the view referred to: but that is immaterial. The writer of a book, however, who knows the value of Dörpfeld's opinion, on matters of architecture especially, and knows that no man ever asked him a question without getting an answer, ought not to let haste prevent him from learning Dörpfeld's *present* view when referring to him. Again, in speaking of the temple of Hera at Olympia, Professor Gardner says that the worship of Hera 'was quite as ancient at Olympia as that of Zeus' (p. 283), evidently inferring this from the temple, which, he says, is 'decidedly more ancient' than that of Zeus. Now Dörpfeld has for some years been in the habit of expressing in his *gyri* at Olympia the view that this old temple, called in Pausanias' time the Heraeum, was originally a temple of Zeus and Hera, Zeus being the principal divinity therein worshipped, and that when the splendid new temple was erected to Zeus in the 5th century the older one was left as the especial property of Hera. It is not to be supposed that because an author recognizes Dörpfeld's great merits, he should therefore adopt all his opinions. But one might have expected some *mention* of his view here. Dörpfeld is at home in Olympia.

One or two matters of minor importance may be mentioned. Professor Gardner in several passages justly takes occasion to plead for a more liberal treatment of the British School at Athens, which with its limited income is doing such a noble work. But when he speaks of it as suffering 'from poverty unknown to the other Schools, which can rely on Government support' (p. 244), his language might surely mislead one to the belief that the American School receives such support.

No reasonable man will, perhaps, in these days quarrel with another over his method of spelling Greek proper names, but when it comes to modern names, if one is to abandon the current English forms, why

write 'Raffaele' (by the way, one might ask why Polygnotus is put down as 'the Raffaele of antiquity' p. 254), instead of going clear over to the Italians? In 'Reubens' (p. 248) we probably have a slip of the printer, who was more conversant with the Twelve Tribes of Israel than with the Flemish painters.

It may be added that the author would have done the public a great service had he employed some man perhaps less busy than himself to compile an index to the book before sending it out into the world. Dyer's book is a model in this respect. But the present work is destined to be much more frequently consulted than Dyer, and often by one who wishes to find some point quickly. It seems as if we had reached a point in book-making, where the lack of an index may be construed as a confession on the part of the author, that he does not expect his book to be used as a book of reference. In the present case that would be an exhibition of modesty entirely uncalled for.

RUFUS B. RICHARDSON.

American School, Athens.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND.

Cologne.—Remains of a large Roman building have been found in which were some important and very fine architectural fragments, also a number of bronzes of artistic workmanship and utensils for domestic use. In a tomb lately opened was a skeleton, with a coin of Gordian III., and a small sword-haft of silver with a gold band down the middle, inscribed in enamel AVSONI VIVAS, also a bronze inkstand richly decorated.¹

Strasbourg.—At a depth of nearly three metres below the surface, in the neighbourhood of the Cathedral, thousands of small Roman coins have been discovered, together with potsherds, bones and horns of beasts, and a large fragment of marble. The bones and horns point to a place of sacrifice and confirm the tradition that the Cathedral was erected on the site of a former heathen temple.²

Diessenhofen in Canton Thurgau.—An earthen pot has been found, containing 155 Roman coins, much rusted, the edges of some being damaged. They bear the names of the emperors Trebonianus Gallus, Gallienus, Aurelius Claudius, and Postumus, and therefore belong to the period 251—270 A.D.³

ITALY AND SICILY.

Fregosi, Venetia.—Two interesting large sepulchral cippi have been found, of good style and well preserved. The first has a cavity for ashes in the base, in which were found a bronze mirror, glass balsamaria, and other objects; it is inscribed

¹ *Athenaeum*, 8 July.

² *Ibid.* 12 August.

³ *Ibid.* 9 September.

BLATTIAE | L.L. FACILI | PAETA MATER | POSIT. The other is inscribed L' BLATTIVS ' L ' F' RO[M] | VETVS CEN[?] LEG I[V] | MA[C]EDON ' ADLE[?] CT | DE] CVRIO; in front are reliefs of *dona militaria*, consisting of *phalerae* and *armillae*. On the left is the *virga* of the centurion and his rectangular shield and *parazonium*; on the right an ornamental design.⁴

Verona.—In removing the old bridge over the river Adige several interesting inscriptions were found built into the piers, both sepulchral and honorary, in characters of the first and second centuries; fragments of silver, bronze, and marble, utensils and coins were also found. The three most important are as follows: (1) GAVIA Q' F' MAXIMA IN AQVAM HS 50 CCCXXX TESTAMENTO DEDIT, i.e. Gavia left 600,000 sesterces for the construction of an aqueduct (cf. *C.I.L.* v. 3402), (2) NOMINE Q' DO[M]ITI ALPINI LICINIA MATER | SIGNVM DIANA]E ' ET VENATIONEM SALIENTIS ' T ' F ' L. (3) M' CASSIO ' C ' F ' POB ' DENTICVLO | IIIVIR ' ARCHITECT | TRIB ' MILITVM (cf. *C.I.L.* v. 3464). This is the only free-born architect mentioned in a Veronese inscription. The name of L. Vitruvius L. l. Cerdo also occurs.⁵

Corneto.—Further excavations have been made in the necropolis, the chief finds being two painted vases which had been used as cinerary urns. The first is an amphora of local fabric, with the figure of a winged horse, in bad style; the other a black-figured Greek amphora with Dionysiac subjects, in the style of the fragments from Kyme in Aeolis (*Röm. Mittheil.* iii. pl. 6). Twelve late vases were also found, of Campanian style, including a kantharos, with three representations in relief each side of Narcissus gazing at himself in the fountain. In other tombs nothing of interest was found except an Athenian amphora of severe style with Hermes and two female figures running on one side, and a combat of three hoplites on the other.⁶

Bolsena.—Among various unimportant remains lately discovered in tombs were four objects in alabaster, each about half a metre high. These are supposed to be the legs of a funeral bier, and are all elaborately turned, the different parts being held together by a rod of iron up the middle; the place at which the bier was affixed to the legs is plainly indicated.⁴

Rome.—The work of laying bare the Stadium Palatinum has been renewed from 1878. On the west side along the wall of the Villa Mills various remains of isolated pilasters were brought to light, which ran along the front of a portico decorated with half-columns of unburnt brick covered with coloured marble, which in parts is still preserved. Two of the pedestals preserve on the inner side the moulded marble cornice. Part of the pavement was also found, formed of marble slabs, with a channel for the droppings from the roof. The wall surrounding the Stadium appears to have had regular arched openings communicating with the palace of Augustus, which were blocked in the times of Hadrian and Septimius Severus. Fragments of various marbles were found, also of tiles with fabric stamps dating from the Flavian epoch down to Diocletian.

At the fourth milestone on the Appian way there is a large mausoleum which was converted into a tower in medieval times. Its origin was unknown hitherto, but the discovery of eleven *loculi* with skeletons, none of which had money placed in the

mouth, points to its having probably been a Christian sepulchre.³

In digging the foundations for a monument to Victor Emmanuel a *cuniculus* was found, the vault of which was decorated with mosaics, the walls and pavement being of white marble. Numerous fragments of sculpture were found, including a statue of Diana with bow and a stag by her side, a Venus, a torso, probably of Diana, a plinth of a statue, and fragments of female figures; also various potters' stamps, all of which were previously known, one with the name of C. Fulvius Plautianus, who was praetorian prefect and consul for the second time with Geta in 203.⁴

A small bronze tablet has been found with an inscription in silver letters, with a palm on one side, and a crown of laurels on the other, dating from the second century of our era. The inscription is GENIO GAVI GERVLONI IANVARI FORTVNATVS DECVRIAE GERVLORVM SERVVS.⁷

Pompeii.—Two large houses have lately been laid bare in Insula 2a, Reg. viii., fronting two streets at a right angle. The façade is partly of *opus reticulatum*, partly of yellow tufa. The first house was in course of reconstruction when it was buried, and the plans of both the old and new houses are visible. One of the *atria* has richly decorated walls, with black panels and architectural borders on a white ground. In the centre of the north wall is a representation of Bellerophon before Proitos and Sthenobea; on the right are a draped male figure holding a kantharos and a dish containing branches, and an equestrian statue in white monochrome, imitating marble; on the left are a youth with a scroll in his hand, and an equestrian statue as before. On the side-walls are female figures with cornucopiae, Cupids, and Nereids. In an adjoining tablinum are fragments of a painting probably representing Hermes, Argos, and Io, and in other rooms are Apollo and Bacchus, Thetis bringing the armour to Achilles, and contests of anguiped giants with Centaurs; in one of the bath-chambers is a painting of an *apoxyomenos*.⁵

In the same insula two gold rings have been found, together with two bronze flutes lined with bone, each about three feet long.²

Ruvo, Apulia.—An important find of painted vases has lately been made, the most important of which is a large krater with volute-handles, with an unusual representation, viz. of the story of Canace, only hitherto known on a vase in the Bari Museum (*Arch. Zeit.* 1883, pl. 7). The scene may be taken from Euripides' lost play, the *Aeolus*; the story is told in Ovid, *Heroides* xi. Aeolus is represented in kingly state in the centre, with Hermes on one side of him, and on the other a warrior, probably Macareus. On the right are Canace with a dagger, and two other female figures, one with torches, who may be Aphrodite. Below this scene are four youths conversing in pairs, and on the rev. a warrior in a *heroön* to whom two women and two youths bring offerings. Among the other vases are a large candelabrum-amphora with a *heroön* on the obv., in which is seated a girl playing with a goose, an *olpe astomos* with Nike, Eros, and a female figure playing on the *trigonon*, and a *praefriculum* with a youthful head, perhaps Dionysos Libykos. With these were found a small diota of enamelled glass, and a terracotta relief of Aphrodite or a hetaira crouching down in an attitude resembling the famous Venus *accroupie* (Visconti, *Mus. Pio-Clem.* i. pl. 10); also a lekythos with polychrome figures painted and in relief, repre-

⁴ *Notizie dei Lincei*, February 1893.

⁵ *Ibid.* January 1893.

⁶ *Notizie dei Lincei*, March 1893.

⁷ *Academy*, 5 August.

senting a wolf-hunt, the hunters being in Oriental costume.⁴

Syracuse.—An archaic tomb in Acradina has been investigated by Dr. Orsi, the contents of which are of considerable interest, chiefly terracottas and vases. Among the latter are: (1) a large b. f. skyphos with an Amazonomachia on the obverse. The painter seems to have been unacquainted with the ordinary type of Amazon-contest on b. f. vases, and has represented all the Amazons on equal terms with their opponents; moreover they are armed after the type of Athene Promachos, with helmet, long chiton, and aegis. Under each handle is a hoplite, and on the rev. are Hermes and five female figures dancing, in the same costume as the Amazons on the obv. (2) A b. f. kylix of the 'Kleinmeister' type, probably by Tleson. In the interior is a fighting cock, very finely executed, and on the exterior each side is inscribed *χαίρει καὶ τίλει εὖ*. (3) Corinthian vases, including an aryballos with a Siren and another with four figures dancing. (4) A b. f. amphora with red and black bands and palmettes on the neck. (5) A fragment of a kylix of fine style with a female figure in an Ionic chiton holding out an oinochoë.⁶

GREECE.

Athens.—Between the city and the Peiræus a very fine votive relief of the end of the fifth century has been discovered, which may possibly be by a pupil of Pheidias. It is dedicated to Hermes and the Nymphs. On one side are three Nymphs, two bearded men, and a female figure who is probably Artemis. On the other side is a youth inscribed Echelos (probably the eponymous hero of the deme of that name) carrying off a female figure inscribed Iasile in a chariot; Hermes stands before the chariot as if obstructing the horses. The myth is hitherto unknown.⁸

Dr. Dörpfeld has resumed his excavations for the 'Εννεάκρονος of Peisistratos, and the flow of water beneath the soil in the direction of the Ilissos points to a likelihood of its coming to light. The famous spring of Kallirrhoe has been unearthed, and the water has recommenced to flow. A beautiful marble torso of a youth was discovered in this neighbourhood. At the crossing of the Leonidas and Mueller streets has been found a lekythos carved with figures in relief, bearing remains of a sepulchral inscription.²

Delphi.—Further information has come to hand about the discoveries of the French Archaeological School. The treasure-house of the Athenians is a building *in antis*, like those of Olympia, but larger. It is a masterpiece of archaic art, and of much finer work than any other of the same period (490-480 B.C.). One of the metopes represents Herakles, another a bull. The subjects are all taken apparently from the exploits of Herakles and Theseus, and this justifies the supposition that the building is the treasure-house of the Athenians. Among other discoveries were a female head of great beauty, half life-size, and an archaic colossal head of Apollo; also an inscription of more than a hundred lines with a list of the out-goings of the temple.⁹ The excavations have been extended and have brought to light remains of some considerable buildings, amongst which must be counted the walls of the temple of the Pythian Apollo. Imbedded in these, and used as building material, was found an archaic marble statue of Apollo in a splendid state of preservation, only the nose and feet being injured. It is above natural size, and has more of an Egyptian appearance than

the well-known Orchomenos and Thera types; the workmanship is very accurate. It is probably a copy of some ancient *zoanon*.¹⁰

ASIA MINOR.

Hissarlik.—The excavations of the German Archaeological Society under Dr. Dörpfeld have been very satisfactory, and the results lead to the conclusion that the Homeric Troy was the sixth below the surface, not the second as Schliemann supposed. The specimens of pottery found resemble, and are apparently synchronous with, the Mycenaean pottery, and the courses of masonry are worked with such excellence as to justify the Homeric epithets. In adjacent tumuli were found specimens of grey pottery. Considerable remains of walling and works of defence of the Mycenaean period were found, including remains of large buildings of the type of the Homeric *megara*; also a very ancient tower approached by a staircase of thirty stone steps. No gold objects have been discovered, but numerous terracottas of the Mycenaean period, including a vase which answers to the description of the Homeric *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον*. Some enormous *pitthoi* were found, about seven feet high, full of burnt or half-consumed grain. In a room apparently used as a kitchen were a long narrow *pitthos*, a small hand-mill for grinding corn, and some archaic spindle-whorls. A Roman inscription was discovered, which throws some light on the history of Ilios.³

AFRICA.

Tunis.—On the site of the ancient Carthage a wall was unearthed, about four metres wide, composed of ancient amphorae placed close together and full of earth, some with painted inscriptions giving the names of Roman consuls. Among these were Hirtius and Pansa who fell at Mutina in 43 B.C. At Dugga in this neighbourhood part of an ancient Roman city was brought to light, including a temple dedicated to Saturn, a theatre, and a private house, which have been completely disinterred and have yielded numerous inscriptions. The temple of Jupiter is now being cleared out.⁸

H. B. WALTERS.

Annuaire de la Société française de numismatique. Paris.

The volume for 1892 contains M. Belfort's papers on the classification of Roman bronze tesserae, and M. Choix's 'Recherche des monnaies coloniales romaines non décrites dans l'ouvrage de M. Cohen.'

Rivista italiana di numismatica. Milan.

The volume for 1892 contains several articles on Roman coins.

Revue numismatique. Paris. Part II. 1893.

Th. Reinach. 'De la valeur proportionnelle de l'or et de l'argent dans l'antiquité grecque' (concluded). —P. Casanova, 'Notes de numismatique himyarite.'

Part III. 1893.

O. Vauvillé, 'Monnaies gauloises trouvées dans le département de l'Aisne.'—E. Babelon, 'Récentes acquisitions du cabinet des médailles.' Describes coins of Lycia, Phrygia and Pisidia acquired for the French Collection. W. W.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik. Berlin. 1893. Vol. XIX. Part 2.

E. A. Stückelberg, 'Nobilissimats-Münzen.' On the titles 'nobilissimus' and 'nobilissima' on Roman coins. W. Drexler, 'Zur antiken Münzkunde.' On Apollo Karinos at Byzantium; some

⁸ *Athenaeum*, 15 July.

⁹ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 15 July.

¹⁰ *Athenaeum*, 19 Aug.

coin-types of Aphrodisias; doves on the edge of vases.—K. F. Kinch, 'Iaton.' On the enigmatical inscription IATON that occurs on some of the coins of Himera in Sicily. Kinch interprets it as the genitive plural of the verbal adjective *iatós*, from *idôai*, meaning 'of the healed.' (The usual meaning of *iatós* however is not 'healed' or 'cured,' but 'curable'.) The inscription is supposed to allude to the curative properties of the mineral springs in the neighbourhood of Himera. This interpretation is perhaps more ingenious than convincing.

The Numismatic Chronicle. Part II. 1893. Rev. W. Greenwell, 'Rare Greek Coins.' Specimens in Mr. Greenwell's collection. Among them are some new Cyzicene staters, including one (circ. B.C. 500) bearing the remarkable type of a winged tunny. A new gold Lampsacene stater is described representing a bearded head of Herakles wearing the head-dress of Omphale.—Reviews. Notice of M. Th. Reinach's essay (Part I.) in the *Revue Numismatique*, 1893, on the origin of bimetallicism, by Barclay V. Head. W. WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin. February—July, 1892.

CORNELIUS NEPOS, 1883—1891, by G. Gemss.

I. Edit. ms. *Cornelii Nepotis vitae*, ed. M. Githbauer. Freiburg i. Breisgau 1883. The text is founded on Halm, but the corrections of Cobet and others are accepted if they make it more readable for schools. *Cornelius Nepos*, with notes by G. Gemss. Paderborn 1884, and *Cornelii Nepotis vitae*, ed. G. Gemss. Paderborn 1885 (text-edition). In both the variations from Halm's text of 1881 are given at the end. *Cornelii Nepotis vitae*, rec. G. Andresen. Leipzig 1884. Aims too much at bringing N. up to the level of Cicero in Latin composition. *Cornelii Nepotis vitae*, rec. A. Weidner. Leipzig, 1884. Useful for schools. *Cornelii Nepotis vitae*, by C. Nipperdey, 9th ed. by B. Lupus. Has taken in a number of conjectures of Halm, Pluygers, Cobet, Andresen and others. *Cornelii Nepotis vitae*, post Carolum Halmium recog. A. Fleckeisen. Leipzig 1884. *Cornelii Nepotis vitae*, by W. Martens. Part I. Text. Part II. Commentary. Gotha 1886. With one exception all notes on the subject-matter and form so far as they are not necessary for the understanding of the text are rejected. *Cornelii Nepotis qui extat liber etc.*, ed. Ortmann. Ed. V. Leipzig 1891. A few changes in the text from the 4th ed. and a few additional notes.

II. On the MSS. and the tradition.

G. Gemss, *Zur Reform der Textkritik des Cornelii Nepos*. Progr. Berlin 1888. Concludes (1) that P (Parcensis) is absolutely the most weighty MS., (2) the edition Ultrajectina (Leyden 1542) comes next to it, nearer than A (cod. Gudianus), (3) to the constitution of the right reading next to A B (Sangallensis), R (Romanus) the M-class (Monacensis) is to be taken into account. G. also discusses the value of cod. Santeianus at Berlin, and codd. Vindobonensis 3155 and Strozianus 57.

III. The present condition of the text of Nepos. Here G. goes into detail through the MSS. variations of the Lives separately.

IV. Contributions to criticism and interpretation. A. On text criticism. E. Anspach, N. Jahr. f. Phil. 1887. A number of emendations, continued ib. 1888. R. Bitschowsky, Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1883. On Epam. i. 2. Ib. 1889. On Them. 6. 5, and Pelop. 2. 5. Ib. Wiener Studien 1882. In Arist. 2. 1 defends the MSS. order of words. W. Böhme, Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. 1885. Various emendations. H. E. Georges, Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. 1884. In Alc. 10. 5 *flammae vim transit* defended. Jurenka, Wiener Studien viii. On Milt. 5. 3. N. Madvig, *Adversaria critica* III. Various emendations. J. Mähly, Zur

Kritik lateinischer Texte. Basel 1886. Various emendations. H. C. Michaelis, Mnemos. xvii. Epam. 5. 6. Reads *cum una urbe* for *ea u. u.* F. Polle, Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. 1881. Paus. 3. 1 reads *stolida* for *callida*. J. Pramner, Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. xli. Gives several places in which the reading of Vind. 3155 is to be preferred. C. Synnberg, *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Cornelius Nepos*, Helsingfors 1889. Various emendations. Fr. Vogel, Blätter f. d. bayer. GSW. xxvii. In Iph. 2. 4 reads *Furiani* after Liv. vi. 9. 11 for *Fabiani*, also emends Cim. 4. 4 and Chabr. 3. 3. B. Subject-matter. Lohr, *Zur Schlacht bei Marathon*, Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. 1883. Especially deals with Milt. 5. Roscher, Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. 1886, *Die Schlangentopfererin des Altarfrieses von Pergamon*. Finds a connection between the account of the fight with snakes in Hann. 10 and the figure of a goddess armed with a vessel encircled by snakes on the altar-frieze at Pergamon. C. Sources. G. Haehnel, *Die Quellen des Cornelius Nepos im Leben Hannibals*, Diss. Jena 1888. Concludes that Sosilus or Silenus or both are the chief sources, and Polybius is used in the introduction. H. Kallenberg, Philol. 36 and 37. The life of Eumenes comes from the same source as the greater part of Plutarch's life. Lippelt, *Quaestiones biographicae*, Diss. Bonn, 1889. Thinks that Nepos had not thoroughly used the writings of Thucydides, Ephorus and Theopompus. D. The Fragments. Dessau, *Ein überschaenes Bruchstück des Cornelius Nepos*. Hermes xxv. Finds a fragment of N. in Augustin 'contra secundum Juliani responsionem.' E. Language. Pretsch, *Zur Stilistik des Cornelius Nepos*. Spandau 1890. On alliteration. Rhyme and play on words and the *figura etymologica*. Completes Lupus' 'Sprachgebrauch' of C.N. Bähnisch, *Sämtliche Sätze des Cornelius Nepos in vollständiger oder verkürzter Form*, Leipzig 1890, and Köhler, *Der Sprachgebrauch des Cornelius Nepos in der Kasusyntax*, Gotha 1888. Both very useful. F. Dictionaries. G. Gemss, *Vollständiges Schulwörterbuch zu Cornelius Nepos*, Paderborn 1886. K. Jahr, *Schulwörterbuch zu Andresen's Cornelius Nepos*, Leipzig 1885. A. Weidner, *Schulwörterbuch zu Weidners Cornelius Nepos*, Leipzig 1887. More copious than Jahr's, all the references being given.

LYSIAS, by E. ALBRECHT.

L. Lutz, *Die Kasusadverbien bei den Attischen Rednern*. Progr. Würzburg 1891. In L. *εἰνεα* occurs once, *ἐνεκεν* three times, *ἐνεκα* twice. Nauck, Hermes 1889. Strikes out 12. 32 *μνηστῆρ γενέσθαι ἢ τοὺς ἀδίκους ἀπολουμένους*. Haberland, Philol. 1890. Conjectures 13. 4 *καὶ δὴ καὶ*. Th. Berndt, Festschrift. Gymn. zu Herford 1890. Writes 24. 13 *πάντα* instead of *πάντας*. R. Schoell, *Zu Lysias' Epitaphios*. Sitz-

ungsber. der bayer. Akad. d. W. 1889, and M. Erdmann, *Zum Epitaphios des Pseudolysias*. WS f. Klass. Phil. 1889. Both of these are appendices to the dissertation and edition of Erdmann 1882. O. R. Paebst, *De orationis ὑπὲρ τοῦ στρατιώτου quae inter Lysiacas tradita est causa, authenticia, integritate*. Diss. Leipzig 1890. Thorough and skilful, but rather prolix. P. Hildebrandt, *De causa Polystratii*. Comment. Philol. München 1891. Especially on the words in § 18 ἔρημον γὰρ αὐτὸν λαβόντες. H. Weil, Discours de Lysias sur le rétablissement de la démocratie athénienne. Rev. de phil. 1891. Contains some notable conjectures.

HORACE 1890—1891, by G. Wartenberg.

I. Editions. Q. *Horatius Flaccus*, by A. Kiessling. Part I. Odes and Epodes. 2nd ed. Berlin 1890. Thoroughly revised and condensed. *Des Q. Horatii Flacci Satiren und Episteln*, by G. T. A. Krüger. 12th ed. by G. Krüger. Part II. Epistles. Leipzig 1890. Only slightly altered. Q. *Horatius Flaccus, Oden und Epoden*, by K. K. Küster. Paderborn 1889, and *Horaz' Oden und Epoden*, ib. 1890. The former is a text only, the latter has the commentary as well. Horace is too much represented as a teacher of morality. Q. *Horati Flacci sermonum et epistolarum libri. Satiren und Episteln des Horaz*, by Lucian Müller. Part I. Satires. Prag. 1891. Q. *Horatius Flaccus*, by J. G. Orellius. 4th ed. Vol. 2. Satires, Epistles, Lexicon Horatianum. Post J. G. Baier cur. W. Mewes. Fasc. II.—V. Berlin 1890—1892. The superiority of the Blandinianus vetustissimus is here inculcated. *Die Oden und Epoden des Q. Horatius Flaccus*, by E. Rosenberg. 2nd ed. Gotha 1890. Much improved from the 1st ed. *Quinti Horatii Flacci opera omnia*, by E. C. Wickham. Vol. II. The satires, epistles and de arte poetica. Oxford 1891. Seldom is found a detailed handling of critical points, but no earlier edition offers so comprehensive an exegesis. [It is to be noted that the rev. has not even seen Wickham's 1st vol.]

II. Treatises. Th. Arnold, *Die griechischen Studien des Horaz*. New ed. by W. Fries. Halle a. S. 1891. Essentially unchanged from the 1st ed. of 1855—6. The best part is that on the successive intimacy of H. with Archilochus, Anacreon, Alcaeus and Sappho. B. Born, *Bemerkungen zu einigen Oden des Horaz*. Progr. Magdeburg 1891. Contains many subtle remarks on the order of words. A. Campaux, *Histoire du texte d'Horace*. Paris-Nancy 1891. Makes a dry subject interesting. Fr. Gebhard, *Gedankenhang horazischer Oden*. München 1891. Nearly as good as a commentary, but rev. is sceptical as to its worth for the higher criticism. J. Gow, *Horatiana II. The Mavortian Recension*. Cl. Rev. IV. 196, and *Keller's three classes of MSS.* ib. IV. 337. G. undertakes the easy task of loosening a few stones from the 'Keller-Holder' building. J. J. Hartman, *De Horatio poeta*. Lugd. Bat. 1891. H. not a god-gifted poet. His ideal is peace and quietness. R. Heinze, *De Horatio Bionis imitatore*. Diss. Bonn 1889, and *Ariston von Chios bei Plutarch und Horaz*. Rhein. Mus. 1890. P. Lewicki, *De natura infinitivi atque usu apud Horatium praecipue lyrico* (Pars prior). Progr. Lemberg 1890. H. not so fond of Grecisms as the commentators assume. C. Marx, *Interpretationum hexas altera*. Ind. lect. Rostock 1889—90. The form *satira* is only another way of writing the mistaken *satyra*, as *u* before *r* could never become *i*. A. Mazzolini, *La villa di Q. Orazio Flacco*. Rev. di fil. 1890. Agrees with de Sanctis and de Chaupy that a spot is meant below Rocca Giovane. H. Nettleship, *Litterary [sic] criticism in latin [sic]*

antiquity. I. Journ. of Phil. xviii. H. takes a position midway between the Cicero-Varronian and the Attic-Alexandrian direction. J. Poirer, *Horace, Etude psychologique et littéraire*. Paris 1890. Rather on the man than the poet. Full of French esprit tempered by a thorough knowledge of the subject. H. Schiller, *Die lyrischen Versmasse des Horaz*. 3rd ed. Leipzig 1891. To make known Westphal's investigations. M. Schneidewin, *Die horazische Lebensweisheit*. Hannover 1890. H. considered as the teacher of worldly wisdom. J. Spika, *De invitatione Horatiana in Senecae canticis chori*. Progr. Wien 1889—90. Stowasser, *Porphyrionea*. Wiener Studien 1890. Emendations to Porphyryon. H. Strimmer, *Kleidung und Schmuck der Römer zur Zeit des Horaz*. Progr. Meran 1889.

III. Criticism and interpretation of separate poems and passages. [The rev. next goes through the whole of Horace, noting emendations and explanations in scattered contributions and separate articles. The latter only are for the most part given here for want of space.] *The Odes*. N. Fritsch, *Zu Horatius' Oden*. N. Jahrb. f. Klass. Phil. 1890. On i. 1. J. Hilbig, *Zu Horatius und Velleius*. Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1891. On i. 2. Cambridge Philolog. Soc. 1890 in Academy. On i. 12. Elter, *Vaticinium*. Rhein. Mus. 1891. On i. 20. A. Palmer, *Horatiana*. Cl. Rev. V. 139. On ii. 11. 21—24, iii. 8. 25—28, iii. 24. 1—8, iv. 13. 17—22, *Carm. Saec.* 25—28. J. M. Stowasser, *Der Schiffbruch des Horaz*. Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1891. On i. 28. A. E. Housman, *Notes on Latin poets*. Cl. Rev. IV. 341. On ii. 3. 1—4. P. Sandford, Cl. Rev. V. 337. On ii. 11. 21. H. Müller, *Zwei Oden des Horaz*. Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1891. On ii. 14 and 20. Th. Plüss, *Zu Horatius*. N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 1890. On ii. 20. P. Seliger, *Die ersten sechs Oden im dritten Buche des Horatius*. N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 1890. J. Mahly, *Kritische Bemerkungen zu lateinischen Schriftstellern*. Philol. 1889. In iii. 4. 9 approves the conj. *limina Dauniae* and conjectures *Vulture in avio*. J. Gow, *Horatiana*. Cl. Rev. IV. 154. On iii. 5. 34—37, 14. 10—12, iv. 2. 49. *Sat. i. 1. 108, 9, ii. 2. 9—14, 3. 208—9, Ep. i. 2. 29—31. Lenzsteiner*. Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1890. On iii. 30. 3. A. E. Housman, Cl. Rev. IV. 273. Supporting Gow on iv. 2. 49. J. S. Speijer, *Ad Horatium*. Mnemos. 1890. On iv. 8. H. Zschau, *Ueber Horatius carm. iv. 8*. Progr. Schweda a. O. 1891. *Carmen Saeculare. Commentarium ludorum saecul. quintorum*, ed. illustr. Th. Mommsen, and *Die Akten zu dem Säkulargedicht des Horaz*. Nation 1891. The celebration took place from the night of 31st May—3rd June a.c. 18 [17?]. Coincidences between the poem and the inser. on the marble column on the Tarentum are pointed out. *The Epodes*. F. van Hoffs, *Zu Horatius*. N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 1890. On Epod. 3. M. Hertz, *Ein paar Horazische Kleinigkeiten in den Comment.* Wölflin. Leipzig 1891. On Epod. 8. 18 and 13. 13. M. Graf, *Die 15 Epode des Horaz*. München 1880. *The Satires*. F. Ch. Häger, *Kleine Beiträge zur Erklärung des Horaz*. Progr. Freising 1890. *Disposition Inhaltsübersicht ausgewählter Satiren des Horaz*. Ansbach 1890. On *Sat. i. 1, 3, 4, 6 and 10, ii. 1. 2. and 6.* Th. Gottlieb, *Handschriftliches zu lateinischen Autoren*. Wiener Studien 1890. G. publishes a collection of the oldest Bernensis 363 for *Sat. i. 1—3 and A. P.* without any textual results. G. S. Sale, *Notes on Horace*. Cl. Rev. V. 137. On *Sat. i. 3. 7, 8; 10, 64—67; A. P. 252—254, 319—322.* F. Marx, *Interpretationum hexas altera VI*. Ind. lect. Rostock 1889—90. J. B. Kan, *Ad. Hor. Sat. i. 6. 9 and 17.* Mnemos. 1890. A. E. Housman, *Adversaria orthographica*. Cl. Rev. V. 296. On ii. 3. 171 foll. K. Meiser, *Zu*

lateinischen Schriftstellern. Bl. f. d. bayer. GWS 1891. *The Epistles*. A. S. O. Cl. Rev. V. 278. On i. 2. 31. Proschberger, *Zu Hor. Epist. i. 3.* 26. Bl. f. bayer. GSW 1890. H. A. Strong, *Cl. Rev. V.* 337. On i. 7. 29. Ch. Häger, *Zu Horaz. epist. i.* 15. 10. München 1891. L. Mueller, *De Horatii*

epistolarum ii. 1. 50-62 *disputatio*. Berlin, 1890. J. C. G. Boot, *Analecta critica*. Mnemos. 1890. H. Nettleship, *Horace de arte poetica*. Journ. of Phil. xix. 296. On li. 90, 172. A. Platt, *Ars Poetica* 349. Cl. Rev. IV. 50.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

Allcroft (A. H.) and Mason (W. F.). The tutorial history of Rome to 14 A.D. Post 8vo. pp. 416. Clive. 3s. 6d.
 Aristophanes. Peace. Literal translation. (Sime, Glasgow.) Houlston & Sons. 1s. 6d.
 — Vespae. Notabilia and test papers. Cr. 8vo. sewed. Clive. 1s.
 — The Wasps with introduction and notes by W. W. Merry. Part I. Introduction and text. Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d.
 Bury (J. B.) A history of the Roman Empire from its foundation to the death of Marcus Aurelius (27 B.C. to 180 A.D.) Post 8vo. pp. 648. Murray. 7s. 6d.
 Caesar. De Bello Gallico I. translation by A. A. J. Nesbitt and F. G. Plaistowe. Cr. 8vo. sewed. Clive. 1s.
 — Gallic War. Book II. Introduction, Notes, &c. by J. Brown. 12mo. Blackie. 1s. 6d.
 Cook (A. M.) Latin Course. Part II. Macmillan & Co. 4s. 6d.
 Cornelius Nepos. Select lives, edited by H. N. Kingdon. Percival & Co. 2s.
 Demosthenes. Adversus Leptinem. Notabilia and test papers. Cr. 8vo. sewed. Clive. 1s.
 Gaddes (W. D.) A compendious Greek Grammar for the use of Schools and Colleges. New edition revised and largely reconstructed. Post 8vo. (Edinburgh, Oliver and B.) Pp. 280. Simpkin. 4s.
 Graham (A.) Horae Otiosi Otiosae. Nursery Rhymes rendered into Latin. Houlston. 1s.
 Greek Papyri in the British Museum. Facsimiles. Folio ¼ morocco. British Museum. £7 15s.
 — Catalogue, with texts edited by F. G. Kenyon. 4to. British Museum. £2 2s.
 Hickie (W. J.) Greek English Lexicon to the New

Testament, after the latest and best Authorities. 18mo. pp. 212. Macmillan. 3s.
 Homer. Iliad VI. edited with notes, introduction, and vocabulary by Walter Leaf and M. A. Bayfield. Macmillan & Co. 1s. 6d.
 Jebb (R. C.) The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus. 2 vols. 8vo. Macmillan & Co. 25s.
 Morice (F. D.) Latin Verse Composition for use of Middle and Upper Forms of School. Post 8vo. pp. 124. Percival. 3s. 6d.
 Nixon (J. E.) and Smith (E. H. C.) Parallel Verse. Extracts for translation into English and Latin with special prefaces on idioms and metres. Post 8vo. pp. 220. Macmillan. 5s. 6d.
 Plantus. Comedies. Translated in the Original Metres by E. H. Sugden. Cr. 8vo. Sonnenschein. 6s.
 Ritchie (F.) Exercises in Latin Prose Composition. Post 8vo. pp. 220. Longman. 2s. 6d.
 Sallust, Catiline. A translation, by T. M. Neatby and A. H. Allcroft. Cr. 8vo. Clive. 1s.
 — A Vocabulary and test papers. Cr. 8vo. sewed. Clive. 1s.
 — Text and Notes. Cr. 8vo. Clive. 2s. 6d.
 — Edited by T. M. Neatby and B. J. Hayes. Cr. 8vo. pp. 187. Clive. 4s.
 Tacitus. Dialogus de Oratoribus. A revised text, with introductory essay, and critical and explanatory notes by W. Peterson. 8vo. pp. 210. Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d.
 Terence. Adelphi. With introduction, notes and critical appendix by Sidney G. Ashmore. 12mo. pp. 206. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.
 Texts and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic literature, edited by J. A. Robinson. Vol. II. No. 3. Apocrypha Anecdota. 8vo. sewed. Cambridge University Press. 6s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Analecta Graeciensia. Festschrift zur 42. Versammlung Deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Wien 1893. 8vo. III. 217 pp. Graz, Styria. Mk. 10.
 Aratus, Phaenomena: recensuit et fontium testimoniorumque notis, prolegomenis, indicibus instruxit E. Maass. Adjecta est vetusta caeli tabula Basileensis. 8vo. xxxvi, 100 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 5 Mk.
 Bahl (J.) De epistularum Latinarum formulis. Diss. 40 pp. 8vo. Erlangen.
 Bandelin (E.) De rebus inter Aegyptios et Romanos intercedentibus usque ad bellum Alexandrinum a Caesare gestum. Diss. 63 pp. 8vo. Halle.
 NO. LXIII. VOL. VII.

Bauer (L.) Handschriftliche und kritisch-exegetische Erörterungen zu den Punica des Silius Italicus. Pr. 55 pp. 8vo. Augsburg.
 Becker (K.) Die Hauptregeln der lateinischen Syntax. 8vo. 24 pp. Duisburg, Ewich. 50 pf.
 Becker (F.) Die sittlichen Grundanschauungen Senecas. Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung der stoischen Ethik. Pr. 21 pp. 4to. Köln.
 Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Herausgegeben von M. Schanz. Band III. Heft 4. 8vo. Würzburg, Stuber. Mk. 4.
 [Contents: Dyroff, A. Geschichte des Pronomen reflexivum. Abthg 2. Die Attische Prosa und Schlussergebnisse. 186 pp.]

- Belling* (H.) Kritische Prolegomena zu Tibull. 8vo. 97 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 Mk.
- Bertram* (H.) Die Bildersprache Platons. Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung der schriftstellerischen Kunst des Philosophen. Pr. 14 pp. 4to. Pforta.
- Birt* (T.) De Xenophontis Commentariorum Socraticorum compositione. 4to. xxii pp. Marburg, Elwert. 1 Mk.
- Bischoff* (E.) Prolegomena zu Dionysius Cato. Diss. 8vo. 65 pp. Erlangen.
- Boer* (Z. C.) Woordenboek op Xenophon's Anabasis. 8vo. viii, 203 pp. Tiel, Campagne. Zoon bound. 2 fl. 50.
- Boehm* (C.) De cottabo. Diss. 8vo. 58 pp. Bonn.
- Boesch* (F.) De XII tabularum lege a Graecis petita, quaestiones philologiae. Diss. 84, 3 pp. 8vo. Göttingen.
- Bohne* (R.) Wie gelangt Plato zur Aufstellung seines Staatsideals, und wie erklärt sich sein Urteil über die Poesie in demselben? Pr. 41 pp. 4to. Berlin.
- Bohse* (P.) Die Moira bei Homer. Pr. 23 pp. 4to. Berlin.
- Bruchmann* (C. F. H.) Beiträge zur Ephoros-Kritik. II. Pr. 25 pp. 4to. Breslau.
- Bruns* (J.) Interpretationes variae. Pr. 17 pp. 4to. Kiel.
- Capps* (E.) Vitruvius and the Greek stage. 23 pp. 8vo. Chicago.
- Caesar*. Commentarii de bello civili. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von R. Menge. Kommentar unter dem Text. 8vo. viii, 250 pp. Plate. Gotha, F. A. Perthes. Mk. 2.40.
- Cauer* (F.) Philotas, Kleitos, Kallisthenes. Beiträge zur Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen. [Extract: Jahrbücher für classische Philologie. 20th Suppl. Band.] 8vo. 79 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- Christ* (V.) Horatiana. 96 pp. 8vo. München.
- Cicero*. Briefe. Für den Schulgebrauch mit Einleitungen zu allen Schreiben herausgegeben von A. Lange. 12mo. 172 pp. Illustrations. Paderborn, F. Schöningh. Cloth. Mk. 1.40.
- Clerc* (M.) Les Métèques Athéniens. Étude sur la condition légale, la situation morale et le rôle social et économique des étrangers domiciliés à Athènes. Thèse. 8vo. 482 pp. Paris, Thorin et Fils.
- Codex Festi Farnesianus XLII tabulis expressus*, edidit A. T. de Ponor. Folio. v pp. of Letterpress. Budapesth. 42 Mk.
- Czylinski* (L.) Einige Bemerkungen über die Composition des Sophokleischen Philoktet. 8vo. 15 pp. Krakau, Polnische Verlags-Gesellschaft. 60 pig.
- Curtius und Kaupert*. Karten von Attika. Heft 7. 2 Blatt. Berlin, G. Reimer. 6 Mk.
- Czyckiewicz* (A.) Betrachtungen über Homers Odyssee. Pr. 3. 44 pp. 8vo. Brody.
- Deichmann* (C.) Das Problem des Raumes in der griechischen Philosophie bis Aristoteles. 8vo. 103 pp. Leipzig, G. Fock. Mk. 2.50.
- Demosthenes*. Codex Z. Fac-similé du MS. grec 2034 de la Bibliothèque nationale contenant les Oeuvres complètes de Demosthène publié par H. Omont. 2 vols. Folio. 42 pp. 1,000 plates. Paris, Leroux. 600 fr.
- Denkmäler, Antike*. Herausgegeben vom kaiserlich deutschen Archaeologischen Institut. Band II. Heft 1. Folio. Plates and Illustrations. Berlin, G. Reimer. 40 Mk.
- Diodorus*. Bibliotheca historica. Editio I. curavit I. Bekker. Editio II. L. Dindorf, recognovit F. Vogel. Vol. III. 12mo. xlix, 497 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.
- Dio Prusaensis, quem vocant Chrysostomum, quae exstant omnia, edidit, apparatu critico instruxit J. de Armin.* 8vo. xl, 338 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 14 Mk.
- Dittmar* (H.) Horati libri II satiram VI interpretatus est H. D. Pars II. Pr. 15 pp. 4to. Magdeburg.
- Dohmen*. Akamas und Demophon. Pr. 93. 16 pp. 4to. Duisburg.
- Draheim* (H.) Aesopus Latinus. Pr. 93. 36 pp. 4to. Berlin.
- Dunzelmann* (E.) Das römische Strassennetz in Norddeutschland. [Extract: Jahrbücher für class. Philologie. 20 Suppl. Band.] 8vo. 81—141 pp. 3 Maps. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- Ebers* (G.) Antike Portraits. Die hellenistischen Bildnisse aus dem Fajjūm, untersucht und gewürdigt. 8vo. 73 pp. Illustrations. Leipzig, Engelmann. Mk. 1.60.
- Engelbrecht* (A.) Das Titelwesen bei den spätlateinischen Epistolographen. 59 pp. 8vo. Wien.
- Epictetus*, Manuel. Texte grec et traduction française en regard. Avec introduction par H. Joly. 12mo. xxiv, 56 pp. Paris, Delalain. 1 fr.
- Eranos Vindobonensis*. 8vo. vi, 386 pp. Illustrations. Wien, Holder. Mk. 10.
- Feustell* (H.) De comparationibus Lucretianis. Diss. 51 pp. 8vo. Halle.
- Ficker* (G.) Studien zur Hippolytfrage. 115 pp. 8vo. Halle.
- Fischer, P. G. u. F. Köppler*. Der gestirnte Himmel. Versuch einer Uebersetzung der Phaenomena Aratea des Rufus Festus Avienus. Pr. 32 pp. 8vo. Komotau.
- Fries* (C.) Quaestiones Herodoteae. Diss. 38 pp. 8vo. Berlin.
- Gerhard* (E.) Etruskische Spiegel. Band V. Bearbeitet von Klüggmann und Körte. Heft 11. 4to. Pp. 129—148. Plates. Berlin, G. Reimer. 9 Mk.
- Gidionson* (W.) Studien zu den Litteraturbriefen des Horaz. Pr. 14 pp. 4to. Schleswig.
- Gnaedinger* (C.) De Graecorum magistratibus eponymis quaestiones epigraphicae selectae. Diss. 49 pp. 8vo. Strassburg.
- Goetz* (G.) De Placidi glossis commentatio tertia. Pr. 8 pp. 4to. Jena.
- Goetzeler* (L.) Animadversiones in Dionysii Halicarnassensis antiquitates romanas. Pars I. 8vo. 84 pp. München, T. Ackermann. 2 Mk.
- Groebe* (P.) De legibus et senatusconsultis anni 710. quaestiones chronologicae. Diss. 8vo. vi, 48 pp. Leipzig. Mk. 150.
- Gregorius* (A.) De M. Annaei Lucani Pharsaliae tropis. Pars prior. (De metaphora, synecdoche, autonomasia.) Diss. 76 pp. 8vo. Tübingen.
- Gruenbergh* (A.) De Valerio Flacco imitatore. 8vo. 94 pp. Berlin, R. Heinrich. Mk. 2.40.
- Haemmerle* (A.) Studia Salviana. Diss. 41 pp. 8vo. Erlangen.
- Hammer* (C.) Beiträge zu den 19 grösseren quintilianischen Deklamationen. Pr. 58 pp. 8vo. München.
- Haemmerle* (A.) Studien zu Salvian, Priester von Massilia. I. Teil. Pr. 42 pp. 8vo. Landshut.
- Harder* (F.) Astrognostische Bemerkungen zu den römischen Dichtern. Pr. 26 pp. 4to. Berlin.
- Hauack* (G.) Plutarch von Chaeronea, der Verfasser des Gastmahls der 7 Weisen. Pr. 63 pp. 8vo. Burghausen.
- Heller* (M.) Quibus auctoribus Aristoteles in Republica Atheniensium conscribenda et qua ratione usus sit. Diss. 8vo. 57 pp. Berlin. Mk. 1.50.
- Herodas*. Mimiamben, herausgegeben und erklärt

- mit einem Anhang über den Dichter, die Ueberlieferung und den Dialekt von R. Meister. 8vo. 274 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. Mk. 10.
[Extract: Abhandlungen der königl. Sächsischen Gesellsch. d. Wiss.]
- Hervieux* (L.) Les Fabulistes latins depuis le siècle d'Auguste jusqu'à la fin du Moyen âge. Tome III. Avianus et ses anciens imitateurs. 8vo. iii, 535 pp. Paris, Didot et Cie.
- Hettner* (F.) Die römischen Steindenkmäler des Provinzial-Museums zu Trier mit Ausschluss der Neumagener Monumente. Mit einem Beitrag von H. Lehner. Illustrations by Lichler und Thomas. 8vo. v, 294 pp. Trier, Lintz. 4 Mk.
- Hierocles'* Synecdemus. Accedunt fragmenta apud Constantinum Porphyrogenetum servata et nomina urbiū mutata, recensuit A. Burckhardt. 12mo. xlix, 88 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 1.20.
- Holub* (J.) Unter den erhaltenen Handschriften der Germania des Tacitus ist die Stuttgarter Handschrift die beste. Pr. Weidenau. 93. 32 pp. 8vo.
- Homers* Odyssee. Erklärt von V. H. Koch. Neu bearbeitet von Capelle. Heft 1. (α—δ.) 8vo. 179 pp. Hannover, Hahn. Mk. 1.20.
- Huber* (S.) Die Glückseligkeitslehre des Aristoteles und des hl. Thomas v. Aquin. Diss. 96 pp. 8vo. Münster.
- Hundeck* (P.) Quaestiones Lysiaca. Pr. 9 pp. 4to. Luckau.
- Huit* (C.) La Vie et l'oeuvre de Platon. 2 vols. 8vo. ix, 507 and 482 pp. Paris, Thorin et fils.
- Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, herausgegeben von A. Fleckeisen. 20. Supplement Band. Heft 1. 8vo. 340 pp. 3 maps. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
- Joachim* (R.) Antigone von Sophokles. In den Vermassen der Urschrift übersetzt. Pr. 73 pp. 8vo. Duisburg.
- Jan* (F. v.) De Callimacho Homeri interprete. Diss. 112 pp. 8vo. Strassburg. 2 Mk.
- Kesberg* (A.) Des Aristoteles Schrift über die Staatsverfassung der Athener, in deutscher Uebersetzung. Pr. 45 pp. 4to. Eupen.
- Koh* (G.) Q. Horatius Flaccus im Licht des Evangeliums. Die 4 Bücher der Oden deutsch in den Versweisen des Dichters wiedergeben und mit Erläuterungen ihres religiös-sittlichen Inhalts versehen. 8vo. xv, 116 pp. Leipzig, F. Richter. 2 Mk.
- Korts* (F.) Quaestiones grammaticae de Julii Frontini operibus institutae. Diss. 110 pp. 8vo. Münster.
- Koschambar-Lyskowski* (J.) Die Theorie der Exceptionen nach klassischen römischen Recht. Band I. Heft 1. Der Begriff der exceptio. xxiii, 173 pp. Berlin, Guttentag. Mk. 6.
- Krah* (F.) Der Reformversuch des Tiberius Gracchus im Lichte alter und neuer Geschichtschreibung. Pr. 11 pp. 4to. Düsseldorf.
- Krause* (K.) Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen bei dem Historiker Herodian. I. Teil: Frequenz *ὅν* und *κατά* c. genit. (statistisch-lexikalische Studie). Pr. 12 pp. 8vo. Strehlen.
- Kunze*, A. Sallustiana. 2. Heft: Der Gebrauch von fore, futurum esse, foret, forent, essem und seinen Formen. 100 pp. 8vo. Leipzig.
- Kuzinsky* (V.) Die Ausgrabungen zu Aquincum. 1879—1891. Illustrations. 8vo. iii, 125 pp. Budapest, Kilian. 6 Mk.
- Laves*. Vergils Eklogen in ihren Beziehungen zu Daphnis. Pr. 8 pp. 4to. Lyck.
- Lesser* (E.) Quaestiones Aeschyleae de ubertate verborum eum praepositionibus compositorum. Diss. 42 pp. 8vo. Halle.
- Leyhausen* (J.) Helenae et Herus epistulae Ovidii non sunt. Diss. 64 pp. 8vo. Halle.
- Lidzbarski* (M.) De propheticiis, quae dicuntur, legendis arabicis. Prolegomena. Diss. 64 pp. 8vo. Leipzig. Mk. 2.
- Liers* (H.) Annahme und Verweigerung der Schlacht im Altertum. Pr. 16 pp. 4to. Waldenburg.
- Lipsius* (J. H.) Von der Bedeutung des Griechischen Rechts. Gel. 32 pp. 8vo. Leipzig.
- Livius*. Ab urbe condita liber xxix. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von F. Luterbacher. 8vo. 84 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 1.20.
- Lottich* (O.) Statius' Trostgedicht an den Claudius Etruscus (silv. III. 3) mit sachlichen und kritischen Erklärungen. Pr. 34 pp. 4to. Hamburg.
- Ludwich* (A.) Homerica I.—V. Programm. 4to. 20 pp. Königsberg. 20 pf.
- Macke* (R.) Die römischen Eigennamen bei Tacitus. IV. (Schluss). Pr. 18 pp. 4to. Hadersleben.
- Magnus* (H.) Studien zur Ueberlieferung und Kritik der Metamorphosen Ovids. 5. Tl. Liber xv. Pr. 29 pp. 4to. Berlin.
- Mair* (G.) Jenseits der Rhipäen. A. Die Fahrten des Pytheas in der Ostsee. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Bernsteinhandels. Pr. 20 pp. 8vo. Klagenfurt.
- Maximaltarif des Diocletian herausgegeben von T. Mommsen, erläutert von H. Blümner. 4to. xiii, 206 pp. Berlin, G. Reimer. 14 Mk.
[Extract: Corpus inscriptionum latinarum. Vol. III. Suppl.]
- Mayer* (J.) Studia in epigrammata Graeca. Diss. 68 pp. 8vo. Münster.
- Merguet* (H.) Cicero-Lexikon. Heft 13. Jena, Fischer. 12 Mk.
- Meusel* (H.) Conjecturae Caesarianae. 8vo. xvi, 182 pp. Berlin, W. Weber. 4 Mk.
[Extract: Lexicon Caesarianum.]
- Lexicon Caesarianum. Fasciculi xviii. et xix. 8vo. Berlin, W. Weber. 5 Mk. 2 vols. complete 45 Mk.
- Michaelis* (K. T.) De Plutarchi codice manuscripto Matritensi. Pr. 49 pp. 4to. Berlin.
- Mocker* (G. B.) De Musis a poetis Graecorum in compendis carminibus invocatis. Diss. 68 pp. 8vo. Leipzig.
- Nestle* (W.) Funde antiker Münzen im Königreich Württemberg. 8vo. iv, 115 pp. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. Mk. 1.50.
- Neumann* (M.) Eustathios als kritische Quelle für den Iliastext. Mit einem Verzeichniss der Lesarten des Eustathios.
[Extract: Jahrbücher für classische Philologie. 20 Supplement Band.] 8vo. 143—340 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk.
- Neuhäffer* (R.) Schiller als Uebersetzer Vergils. Pr. 93. 41 pp. 8vo. Warendorf.
- Neumann* (J.) Menelaos und Helena in den Dramen des Euripides. Pr. 24 pp. 8vo. Zittau.
- Nordin* (R.) Studien in der Themistoklesfrage. Diss. 110 pp. 8vo. Upsala.
- Ostbye* (B.) Die Schrift vom Staat der Athener und die attische Ephebie. [Extract: Christiania Videnskabs-Selskabs Forhandlinger.] 8vo. 55 pp. Christiania, Dybwad. Mk. 1.
- Pauzy*. Real-Encyclopaedie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Fachgenossen herausgegeben von G. Wissowa. Halbband I. 8vo. Columns 1—1440. Stuttgart, Metzler. 15 Mk.
- Peiper* (R.) De Senecae tragodiarum lectione vulgata. Gel. 55 pp. 8vo. Breslau.
- Pfitzner* (W.) Ist Irland jemals von einem römischen

- Heere betreten worden? Eine historisch-philologische Untersuchung über Tacitus' Agricola Kapitel 24. 8vo. 39 pp. Neustrelitz. Barnewitz. Mk. 1.
- Philostrati majoris imagines, O. Benndorfii et C. Schenkeli consilio et opera adjuti recensuerunt seminariorum Vindobonensium Sodales. 12mo. xxxi, 267 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 2.80.
- Piristi (H.) Prodigien, Wunder und Orakel beim Historiker Zoismus. Pr. 26 pp. 8vo. Brixen.
- Pischinger (A.) De arbitris Atheniensium publicis. Pr. 50 pp. 8vo. München.
- Planta (R.) Vocalismus der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte nebst einer Einleitung und einem Abschnitt über die Liquidae und Nasale. Diss. 324 pp. 8vo. Zürich.
- Plautus. Comoediae. Ex recensione G. Goetz et F. Schoell. Fasciculus 1. Amphitruonem, Asinariam, Aululariam complexens. Praecedunt de Plauti vita ac poesi testimonia veterum. 12mo. xxxiii, 158 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 1.50.
- Poppelreuter (J.) De comoediae Atticae primordiis particulae duae. Diss. 45 pp. 8vo. Berlin.
- Pridik (E.) De Alexandri Magni epistularum commercio. Diss. 8vo. 166 pp. Dorpat. Mk. 3.60.
- Ranzen (J.) Phönizien. Nach den neueren Forschungen. Land und Volk, Kunst, Religion. Pr. 27 pp. 4to. Ostrowo.
- Rappold (J.) Chrestomathie aus lateinischen Classikern. Zur Erleichterung und Förderung des Uebersetzens aus dem Stegreife zusammengestellt. 16mo. xiv, 193 pp. Wien, Gerold's Sohn. Mk. 2.
- Chrestomathie aus griechischen Classikern. Zur Erleichterung und Förderung des Uebersetzens aus dem Stegreife zusammengestellt. 16mo. x, 93 pp. Wien, C. Gerold's Sohn. Mk. 1.40.
- Raumer (S.) Die Metapher bei Lucrez. 8vo. vi, 129 pp. Erlangen, T. Blaesing. Mk. 1.50.
- Reinhardt. Untersuchungen über Ciceros Offizien (mit einer Einleitung über den Mangel an Idealismus bei den Römern). Pr. 18 pp. 4to. Oels.
- Reitzenstein (R.) Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Alexandrinischen Dichtung. 8vo. vii, 288 pp. Giessen, Ricker. 6 Mk.
- Sagave. $\delta\epsilon$ im Nachsatz bei Herodot. Gel. 25 pp. 8vo. Breslau.
- Schmid (W.) Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den 2ten Philostratus. Band III. 7th Abschnitt: Aelian. 8vo. 349 pp. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. Mk. 7.20.
- Schmidt (H.) De Graecorum et emoriente et reviviscente. 8vo. 54 pp. Breslau, Koebner. Mk. 2.50. [Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen Band VI. Heft 4.]
- Schreiber, T. Reliefbilder. Lieferung 10. Leipzig, Engelmann. Mk. 20.
- Schneidewin. Studien zu Ciceros philosophischen Schriften. Pr. 24 pp. 4to. Hameln.
- Schoene (H.) De Aristoxeni $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\iota$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ Ἡροφίλου αἰπέσως libro tertio decimo a Galeno adhibito. Diss. 29 pp. 8vo. Bonn.
- Schulle (J. F.) De decreto ab Omnibono abbreviato. Pr. 19 pp. 4to. Bonn.
- Schulze (K. P.) Beiträge zur Erklärung der römischen Elegiker. Pr. 31 pp. 4to. Berlin.
- Semisch (F.) Leben und Dichten des Horaz. I. Der Dichter der Epoden und Satiren. Pr. 26 pp. 4to. Friedberg.
- Šurcka (F.) Quae M. Tullius Cicero de philosophia merita sibi paraverit. Pr. 38 pp. 8vo. Pisek.
- Sepp (S.) Pyrrhonäische Studien (Πυρρωναίοι λόγοι). I. Teil. Die philosophische Richtung des Cornelius Celsus. II. Teil. Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Skepsis. Diss. 149 pp. 8vo. Erlangen.
- Serbin (A.) Bemerkungen Strabos über den Vulkanismus und Beschreibung der den Griechen bekannten vulkanischen Gebiete. Ein Beitrag zur physischen Geographie der Griechen. Diss. 63 pp. 8vo. Erlangen.
- Σπυρόπουλος, Γ., Κατὰ τὴν μίμειται Ἀγαθίας Ἡρόδοτος καὶ Προκόπιον. 34 pp. 8vo. Athen.
- Stein (H.) Stücke aus Thukydides. Deutsch. Mit Anmerkungen. Pr. 22 pp. 4to. Oldenburg.
- Stourac (F.) Ueber den Gebrauch des Genitivus bei Herodot. (Fortsetzung.) Pr. 18 pp. 8vo. Olmütz.
- Studien, Leipzig, zur classischen Philologie, herausgegeben von Ribbeck, Lipsius, Wachsmuth. Band xiv. Heft 2. 8vo. v, 173—355 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 5 Mk.
- Šunpf (O.) Caesars Beurteilung seiner Offiziere in den Commentarien vom gallischen Kriege. Zweiter Teil. Pr. 33 pp. 4to. Quedlinburg.
- Sylloge epigraphica orbis romani. Vol. II. Fasc. 3 and 4. Leipzig, G. Fock. Each 1.40.
- Syrianus, In Hermogenem commentaria edidit H. Rabe. Vol. II. Commentarium in librum Περὶ στασιών . Accedunt indices. 12mo. viii, 222 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Mk. 2.
- Teetz (F.) A. Beiträge zur Rhythmopöie des Sophokles. I. Die Kolometrie in den cantica der Antigone. B. Kritische Bemerkungen zu Soph. Ant. v. 1156—1157 und Caes. b. g. I, 8, 1 und b. g. IV, 17, 9. Pr. 91 pp. 8vo. Bremerhaven.
- Urkunden, Aegyptische aus den königl. Museen. zu Berlin, herausgegeben von der General-Verwaltung. Griechische Urkunden. Heft 6. 4to. Sheets 161—192. Berlin, Weidmann. Mk. 2.40.
- Vergilius. Carmina selecta für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von J. Golling. 12mo. xxxii, 288 pp. Wien, A. Holder. Mk. 1.80.
- Volkmann (D.) Ad itinerarium Alexandri adnotationes criticae. Pr. 13 pp. 4to. Pfort.
- Waller (J.) Die Geschichte der Aesthetik im Altertum, ihrer begrifflichen Entwicklung nach dargestellt. 8vo. xviii, 891 pp. Leipzig, Reisland. Mk. 17.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, U. v. De tribus carminibus latinis. Programm. 8vo. 26 pp. Göttingen, Dieterich's Verlag.
- Winter (A.) Meletius und Orion. 34 pp. 8vo. Breslau.
- Xenophon. Expeditio Cyri. In usum studiosae juventutis textum constituit C. G. Cobet. Editio V. quam curavit C. C. Mauve. 12mo. xxviii, 294 pp. Leiden, E. J. Brill. Mk. 2.15.
- Zanchi (V.) L'Europa e le Troiane di Euripide. Studio critico-litterario. 8vo. xiii, 356 pp. Wien, Konegen. 5 Mk.
- Zeller (C.) Grundriss der Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie. 4th Auflage. 8vo. x, 317 pp. Leipzig, Reisland. Mk. 5.